OF SCHISME.

A DEFENCE OF THE *Church of England*, Againſt the EXCEPTIONS OF *the Romaniſts.*

By H. HAMMOND, D. D.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. Fleſher* for *Richard Royſton*
at the Angel in Ivie-lane.
M. DC. LIV.

Of SCHISME.

A *Defence* of the *Church* of *England*, againſt the *Objections* of the *Romaniſt*.

CHAP. I.

An Introduction, the danger, and ſin of Schiſme.

§. 1 TWO *wiſhes* rather then *hopes* there are, wherein all *Chriſtians* are very much concerned; *Firſt*, That all that have given up their names to that *holy profeſſion*, would ſincerely betake themſelves to the diſcharge of all thoſe *duties* (as well more *common*, one towards another, as more *particular*, of each ſingle man toward *God* and toward *himſelf*) which *Chriſt* came on purpoſe to *plant* in, or reduce into the world: The *Second*, That the *Faith* of *Chriſt* might gain an *amicable*, *univerſal* re-

Two concernments of all Chriſtians.

Practiſe of Chriſtianity.

Propagating of it.

reception in the hearts of all men over the whole world, and that all *mankinde* (by an *uniform* obedience to thoſe divine *precepts* which are moſt *agreeable* to our *rational*, i. e. humane nature, and which are able to *advance* us to the higheſt pitch of *moral excellency* and *dignity*, that any created ſubſtance is capable of) might attain the great *end* of our *creation*, a *paradiſe*, or *bliſful* beeing here in this world, only with the mixture of ſome *allayes* to that bliſſe (and thoſe neceſſary both to the *exerciſe* of ſome moſt eminent *virtues*, and ſuch as the *Angels* are not, for want of paſſible bodies, capable of, and alſo to the *inhaunſing* of our *crown*) and then a ſtate of *infinite* reward, and *uncompounded* felicity hereafter.

What is to be done toward the latter.

§. 2. That the *later* of theſe may in *Gods* good time be effectually attempted by all *Chriſtian Kings*, and *Biſhops*, and advance more *ſucceſsfully*, then of late it hath done, ought to be the *indevour* of all thoſe, whoſe *eminencie* in the world hath given them *capacities*, or *qualifications* to contribute ſome conſiderable degree of

of *aſſiſtance* to ſo *glorious* a work. And for others, whoſe *inferiority* of condition or ſphere of motion, and the *improbability*, conſequent to that, of advancing ſo magnificent a deſigne is their juſt *excuſe* for not entertaining any ſuch *hopeleſs* thoughts, it is yet their certain duty by conſtant, fervent *prayers* to ſolicite the *good hand of God*, who alone can accompliſh ſo divine a work, and by the diligent ſtrict obſervance of all *Chriſts precepts* to *exemplifie* to all others the power, and real *energie* of the *faith* of *Chriſt*, where it is admitted into the heart, thereby to *attract* all others to the *imbracing* of that, which hath ſuch admirable *virtues* in it.

§. 3. As for the *former*, That is (in proportion to his condition) the known duty of every *ſingle Chriſtian*, much more of every *congregation*, and *community* of ſuch; who are therefore *aſſociated* into *one* body, that each ſupplying the *defects*, and infirmities of others, they may by ſo *advantagious* an inſtrument, as *union* of forces is, be *enabled* to doe what without it they are juſtly ſuppoſe-

The chief branches of the former, conſidered in ſociety.

able to *want* means, or *ſtrength* to doe, and ſo are deprived of all excuſe, if they be found culpable.

§. 4. In this kinde 1. The duty of *Charity*, and *peace* to *all*: 2. of ready, and filial *obedience* of thoſe under authority to their lawful authorized *ſuperiours:* and 3. of *charitative paternal* exerciſe of their power, in all thoſe that are inveſted with it by *Chriſt*, may be juſtly looked on as virtues of the *firſt magnitude*, which have the moſt lively *characters*, and impreſſes of the *Law-giver*, *Chriſt's image*, and *ſuperſcription* upon them, & accordingly deſerve the *firſt fruits* of our care and diligence that they be moſt diligently *conſerved*, where they are, and induſtriouſly *reduced*, where by the *malignity*, or infelicity of the times, they are *torn*, or *eſcaped* from us.

Charity.

Obedience.

Paternal exerciſe of Eccleſiaſtical power.

§. 5. For that *malices*, and *rancors*, and *animoſities* among *ſingle Chriſtians*, but eſpecially *ſeditious*, *mutinous* ſpirits, that *diviſions*, and *ſchiſmes*, and *ruptures*, and preparative thereto, *cauſleſs anathematizing*, and *tyrannizing* over the *Faith* of *Chriſt's flock*, are moſt ſcandalouſly con-

The contrariety of Schiſme to the Doctrine of Chriſt.

contrary to *Chriſt's* platform, to the *prophecie* of the *plough-ſhares*, and the *pruning-hooks*, the happy exchange for the *ſanguinary*, *hoſtile* inſtruments, is a truth ſo eminently, and ſignally viſible in the *practiſe*, and *doctrine* of *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, that it cannot be doubted, or queſtioned on either ſide. And agreeably, there is no one vice, which hath fallen under ſo much of the *diſpleaſure*, and *correption*, and ſevereſt diſcipline of the *holy Fathers* of the *Antient Church*, as this of *Schiſme*, and the *ingredients*, and *preparatives* to it have done.

§. 6. It is but a *ſmall* part of the *character* thereof, that from S. *Paul*, and S. *Jude* they tell us, that it is a ſpecial piece of (*a*) *carnality*; an (*b*) *excommunicating* and *condemning*, i. e. *voluntary* inflicting of that *puniſhment* on ones ſelf, which the *Governours* of the *Church* uſe to inflict

The Fathers Cenſures of it.

(a) 1 Cor. 3. 4. Jude 19.

See *Fulgentius ad Mon: l* 2.

(b) *Quiſquis in Eccleſiâ gratiam conſecutus, ab Eccleſiâ exierit, reus ſibi futurus eſt, i. e. ipſe ſibi quòd pereat imputaturus; Quod Apoſtolus explanat, docens hæreticum vitandum eſſe, ut à ſemetipſo damnatũ* Cypr: Ep: 76. *Pœnas quas meruerant pependerunt, ut à nobis non ejecti ultro ſe ejecerent, de eccleſiâ ſponte ſe pellerent*, Ep: 40. *Quomodo te à tot gregibus ſcidiſti? Exſcidiſti enim teipſum.* Firmilian: ad Cypr: Ep: 75.

flict on the moſt *ſcandalous* ſinners; that (*a*) they that ſo *divide* on their *own preſumption*, may not at their *own will return to the Church*, and *communicate* again with the *Biſhop*, and his *Chriſtian* people; that (*b*) it is *contrary* to the *Faith*, (*c*) even when it hath not, in reſpect of *doctrinal* points, any hereſie joyned with it; (*d*) *Contrary* to *charity*, yea to all the (*e*) advantages that belong to

(a) *Sciat ſe poſtea ad Eccleſiam redire, & cum Epiſcopis & plebe Chriſti communicare non poſſe.* Ep: 40. *Averſandus eſt talis atque fugiendus quiſquis fuerit ab Eccleſiâ ſeparatus.* Ibid. De Unit: Eccleſ:

(b) *Hanc Eccleſiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere ſe fidem credit?* Cypr: de Unit: Eccleſ: *Dum conventicula ſibi diverſa conſtituunt, veritatis caput atque originem reliquerunt.* Ibid. *Fidem deſtruit, pro Fide perfidus.* Ibid.

(c) *Schiſma non faciendum, etiamſi in unâ fide & eâdem traditione permaneat qui recedit.* Cypr: Teſtim: l.3. c.86.

(d) *Quam verò dilectionem cuſtodit & cogitat, qui diſcordiæ furore veſanus Eccleſiam ſcindit, pacem turbat, charitatem diſſipat.* Cypr: de Unit: Eccleſ: *Arma ille contra Eccleſiam portat.* Ibid.

(e) *Quiſquis ab Eccleſia ſegregatus adulteræ jungitur, à promiſſis Eccleſiæ ſeparatur.* Cypr: de Unit: Eccl: *Habere jam non poteſt Deum patrem, qui Eccleſiam non habet matrem.* Ibid. *Quomodo poteſt ei cum aliquo convenire, cui cum corpore ipſius Eccleſiæ, & cum veſtra Fraternitate non convenit? Quomodo poſſunt duo aut tres in nomine Chriſti colligi, quos conſtat à Chriſto & ab ejus Evangelio ſeparari?* Ibid: *Extra Eccleſiam conſiſtens, & contra pacem & dilectionem Chriſti faciens, inter adverſarios— computetur.* Ep: 76.

a mem-

a member of the *Church*, the (*f*) benefits of *prayers* and *sacraments*; that it is (*g*) as bad as *heresie*; that (*h*) there was never any *heresie* in the *Church*, which was not *founded* in it; and (*i*) that it is constantly forced, in its own defence, to conclude in some *heresie* or other (all of which being put together will be sufficient to keep men from being in *love* with the *guilt*, or *company* of *schismaticks*) but it is farther branded with these *superadditions* of *terror*, that (*k*) there

(f) Ὑστερεῖν ἀγαθοῦ θεοῦ, Ignat: Ep: ad Eph: *Audet precem alteram illicitis vocibus facere, Dominicæ hostiæ veritatem per falsa sacrificia profanare?* Cypr: de Unit: Eccl: *Unum manifestum est apud omnes Spiritus Sancti gratiam non esse, nec eorum sacrificiis posse Deo placere, neque spiritualis gratiæ sanctificationem sacrificiis eorum tribui, qui offerunt ab Ecclesiastici corporis unitate disjuncti, solius enim Ecclesiæ Deus delectatur sacrificiis, quòd sacrificium Deo facit unitas spiritualis, ubi pacis tenacitas fraternam servat in charitate concordiam.* Fulgent: ad Monim: l. 2.

(g) Τοῦ εἰς αἵρεσιν ἐμπεσεῖν τὸ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν σχίσαι οὐκ ἔλαττόν ἐστι κακόν. Chrys: in Ep: ad Eph: Edit: Savil: p. 823.

(h) *Quis unquam hæreses instituit, nisi qui se priùs ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ universitate, & antiquitatis consensione discreverit?* Vincent: c. 34.

(i) *Nullum schisma non sibi aliquam fingit hæresim, ut rectè ab Ecclesiâ recessisse videatur.* Hieron: ad Tit: c. 3.

(k) *Non esse quicquam gravius sacrilegio schismatis.* Aug: contra Parmen: l. 2. 2. *Ingens flagitium schismatis Traditioni junxerunt.* Optat: p. 23. Edit: Casaub:

is ſcarce *any* crime ſo grear as *ſchiſm*, not (*l*) *idolatry*, (*m*) *ſacrilege*, *parricide*; that it hath been under peculiar marks of *Gods indignation*, in the ſtory of the *Jewiſh Church*, as in the (*n*) caſe of the *ten Tribes*, and of the (*o*) *Samaritanes*, who are ranked with the *Gentiles*, *Mat.* 10. 5. (*p*) and ſo in the *ſtory* of *Core*, &c. that it is the (*q*) *Antichriſtianiſme* mentioned by Saint

(l) Οὐκ ἀδοξοτέρα τ ἕνεκεν τῦ μὴ εἰδωλολατρῆσαι γινομένης ἢ ἕνεκεν τῦ μὴ φόνου μαρτυρία, καὶ ἐμὲ ᾧ μείζων. Dionyſ: ap: Euſeb: l.6. c.36. *Pejus hoc crimen eſt quàm quod admiſiſſe lapſi videntur.* Cypr: de Unit: Eccl:

(m) *Vide* Optatum l.8. c.25.

(n) *Quàm ſine ſpe ſint, & perditionem ſibi maximam de indignatione Dei acquirant, qui ſchiſma faciunt, declarat in libro Reg: ſcriptura, ubi à tribu Juda & Benjamin decem tribus ſciſſæ ſunt, & indignatus eſt, inquit, Dominus in omne ſemen Iſrael.* Cypr: Ep: 76.

(o) *Addendo autem civitatem Samaritanorum debere omitti, ubi erant ſchiſmatici, oſtendit ſchiſmaticos Gentilibus adæquari.* Ibid.

(p) *Exemplo Core, Dathan, &c. oſtenditur & probatur obnoxios omnes & culpæ & pœnæ futuros, qui ſe ſchiſmaticis irreligioſâ temeritate miſcuerunt,* Ibid. *Deus quod in ſacrilegos & parricidam non fecerat, [Cain & Ninive] in ſchiſmaticos fecit, Core, &c.* Optat: l.1. p.25.

(q) *Novatianus nec debet nec poteſt excipi, qua minus ipſe extra Eccleſiam conſiſtens, inter Antichriſtos computetur,* Ibid. *Apparet Antichriſtos omnes eſſe quos conſtet à charitate atque ab unitate Eccleſiæ receſſiſſe,* Ibid. *Videndum quis foras exierit, quis altare contra altare erexerit, quis jaceat ſub ſententiâ Johannis*

Saint *John*, the (r) *worſhipping* or *ſerving the Devil*, and, in a word, ſo great a crime, that it is not (ſ) *expiable* by *Martyrdome* to him that *continues* in, and hath not *repented*, and returned from it.

hannis Apoſtoli, qui dixit multos Antichriſtos foras exituros, Optat: p. 1. l. 18. *Ab Eccleſiâ ſeparatus hæreticus eſt, & Antichriſtus,* Proſper de Prom: & Prædict: implend: c. 5.

(r) τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει, Ignat: Ep: ad Smyrnenſ:

(ſ) *Tales etſi occiſi in confeſſione nominis fuerint, macula iſta nec ſanguine abluitur, inexpiabilis & gravis culpa diſcordiæ nec paſſione purgatur,* Cyprian: de Unit: Eccl:

§. 7. Much more of this ſubject is every where to be met with in the *Antient* monuments, and nothing of *alleviation* to be had for any, who have not the (t) *excuſe* of *involuntary ſeduction*, of *error*, or *ſimplicity* to plead for them, and the ſureſt way to doe that effectually, to *qualifie* them for that plea, is to *forſake* their courſe, to *get out* of ſo *dangerous* a ſnare.

No excuſe for it.

(t) *Cæteri tantum vel ſimplicitate capti, vel errore inducti, vel aliqua fallentis aſtutiæ calliditate decepti, à fallaciæ laqueis vos ſolvite,* Cypr: de Unit: Eccl:

§. 8. Nay 'tis farther obſervable, how unſafe it hath been deemed by theſe, for (u) *light*, and *inconſiderable* cauſes to break this *unity*, it being in their opinion *very* (x) *hard*, if not

(u) *Judicabit ſpiritalis & eos qui ſchiſma operantur, qui propter modicas & quaſlibet cauſas, magnum & glorioſum corpus Chriſti conſcindunt, & dividunt, verè liquantes culicem, & camelum diglutientes,* Irenæ: l. 4. c. 62.

(x) *Nulla ab eis tanta poteſt fieri correptio, quanta eſt ſchiſmatis pernicies,* Irenæus l. 4. c. 62.

impoſſible to receive ſuch an *injury*, or *provocation* from the *Governours* of the *Church*, as may make a *rupture*, or ſeparation *excuſable*. And for the *Univerſal*, or truly *Catholick Church* of *Chriſt*, it is not, in (*y*) S. *Auguſtine*'s opinion, *poſſible* that there ſhould be any juſt cauſe for any to *ſeparate* from it, nor conſequently *Apologie* to be made for thoſe, that on any, whether true, or pretended cauſe whatſoever, have *really* incurred this guilt.

(*y*) *Si poſſunt aliqui (quod fieri non poteſt) habere cauſam juſtam quo communionem ſepa rent à communione Orbis terrarum.* Aug: Ep: 48.

§. 9. From theſe *premiſes* thus acknowledged and undeniable, the *concluſion* follows *irrefragably*, that it is not the examination of the *occaſion*, or *cauſe*, or *motive* of any mans *ſchiſme*, that is worth the producing or heeding in this matter; The one thing that is of *force*, and moment, and, by conſequence, pertinent to be inquired into, is the *truth* of the matter of *fact*, whether this charge be ſufficiently *proved* or confeſſed, i. e. whether he that is thus *accuſed*, ſtands really guilty of *ſeparation* from the *Church* of *Chriſt*; And this will be a means of *ſhortening* our method, and giving very *moderate* bounds

bounds to our enſuing diſcourſe, which will now be regularly finiſhed by making theſe *two inquiries.*

§. 10. 1. What *Schiſme* is, and how it may be moſt fitly *branched.* The Parts of the enſuing Tract.

§. 11. 2. What *Evidences* are producible againſt the *Church of England,* whereby it may be thought liable to this *guilt,* and withall how it may be cleared from all force of thoſe evidences.

§. 11. Which when we have done, we ſhall not from the office of *Advocates* proceed to that of the *Accuſer,* or *Judge,* but leave all others, that are under the ſame charge, to their *proper tribunal,* to ſtand or fall, as they ſhall appear able, or not able, upon *firm* grounds, to *maintain,* and *vindicate* their *innocence.*

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

What Schiſme is, together with ſome general conſiderations thereon.

§. 1. OUR *firſt enquirie* muſt be *what Schiſm* is, in the ſtrict & *proper* notion (as (*a*) diſtinguiſhed from *Hereſie*, the (*b*) introducing of ſome *falſe doctrine* into the *Church*.) And herein there will be no difficulty the *Origination*, and *univerſal uſe* of the word, *according* and *conſenting* exactly, to give us the importance of it.

(a) *Non attendiſti inter ſchiſmaticos & hæreticos quàm ſit magna diſtantia.* Optat: l.1. p.13.

(b) *Inter hæreſim & ſchiſma hoc intereſſe arbitramur, quòd hæreſis perverſum dogma habeat, ſchiſma propter Epiſcopalem diſſenſionem ab Eccleſiâ pariter ſeparet.* Hieron: ad Tit: c.3.

The Original of the word *Schiſm.*

§. 2. In the *origination* of it from χίζω, *ſcindi*, it ſignifies literally *ſciſſure*, or *diviſion*, which being a *figurative*, and withall a *relative* word, referring to ſome *body*, which is thus *cut* or *divided*, but that no *natural*, but *political body*, the *Church*, or *Congregation* of *Chriſtians*, the *literal* notation of the word in the *Eccleſiaſtical* uſe, will be ἡ ἐνότητος διαίρεσις,

διαίρεσις, *a diviſion* in or *from the Unity of the Church of Chriſt.* Only the *form* & *termination* of the word muſt be farther noted, which being not χίσις from the *active* χίζω, but χίσμα from the *paſſive* χίζομαι, the uſe of ſuch *paſſives* is obſervable, being of the nature (and for want of *conjugations*, deſigned to ſupply the place) of the *Hebrew Hithpael*, and ſo noting *reciprocal action* or *paſſion*, where the *paſſion* is *from*, and *on himſelf*, and is moſt fully expreſſed by the *Latine Neutrals*, which partake both of *active* and *paſſive*, but are ſtrictly neither of them. This might be largely exemplified in the uſe of other words, but the *advantage* of the *obſervation* will not be proportionable to the length of ſuch a *diverſion*, being no more then this, that the diſtinct notion of the word [*Schiſme*] is a *voluntary* dividing, or, in the *neutral* expreſſion, which the *Fathers* familiarly uſe, a *ſeparating*, or *receding* of any member from the *unity* of the *body*, i. e. the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and ſo that the *ſciſmatick* is he that * *divides himſelf* from the *Church of God*, not that is *cut off*, or *ſeparated*,

Reciprocal paſſion noted by the word.

Schiſme a voluntary receſſion.

* ἀποδιορίζοντες ἑαυτούς, Jude 19.

separated, he that (*a*) *goes out*, or (*b*) *withdraws*, or *recedes* of his own accord, not he that *is cast out* by the *Governours* of the *Church*. For whatever *blame*, and vengeance may justly light on such, who are by the *righteous*, and *charitative Censures* of the *Church*, *cut off* from *communion*, in case they doe not by *humiliation*, *confession*, and *reformation*, and *meet fruits* of *repentance*, prepare and qualifie themselves for *readmission* to that *Communion*, yet certainly this punishment of *Excommunication* is very disparate and distant from the *crime* of *schisme*, the *Judge*, i.e. *Bishop* or *Governour* of the *Church*, being the only *actor* in the one, (and that *ex officio*, an act of *duty* in him, when duly executed) but in the other, the *offender*, or guilty person, who is therefore said to (*c*) *accuse*, to *cast*, to (*d*) *condemn himself*, throwing himselfe, by his *voluntary recession*

Excommunication no Schisme.

(*a*) ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον. 1 Joh. 2. 19.
(*b*) ἐὰν ὑποστείλῃ. Heb. 10. 38.
(*c*) ἑαυτὸν αἰτιάσῃ. Concil: Laod: Can: 40.
(*d*) *Propriæ conscientiæ videtur esse damnatio, cùm quispiam suo arbitrio ab Ecclesiâ recesserit.* Hieron: Αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτὸν τῆς καταδίκης ψῆφον ἐκπεφωνηκέναι κριθήσεται. Cod: Can: Afric: Can: 22.

from

from the *Church*, into that very condition, into which the *adulterer*, and *obſtinate* offender is caſt by the *Cenſures* of it.

§. 3. This is ſo evident a truth, that this *puniſhment*, and ſo *judicial* act, of the *Governour*, cannot be the *guilt* of him that is *puniſhed*, and though it be ſuppoſed to be founded in ſome *offence*, is not yet in any propriety of ſpeech the *offence* it ſelf, much leſſe the *ſin* of *ſchiſme*, eſpecially when he is *puniſhed* for *hereſie*, or ſome other crime, and not for *ſchiſme*, that I need not farther inſiſt on it. Only, as beſide the formal ἀφορίσεις, there is alſo an *interpretative excõmunication*, when he that is not under the *Cenſures* of the *Church*, is yet refuſed *admiſſion*, or reception unto it, unleſſe he will ſubmit to ſuch & ſuch *conditions*, indiſpenſably propoſed to him, and becauſe both in the one, and the other, in the *formal*, and in the *interpretative excommunication*, the *Governours*, being men, may poſſibly *erre*, and conſequently *cenſure*, and *excommunicate* the *innocent*, and in like manner propoſe thoſe *conditions* of *communion* which are not

Interpretative Excommunication.

Continuance out of actual Communion, without Schiſme.

not *lawful* for that man to ſubmit unto, ſo it is poſſible in both caſes, that the perſon excluded may be abſolutely *innocent*, free not only from that of *ſchiſme*, but from all other guilt, ſo that he which is *excommunicated* may not be obliged to regain the *peace*, nor he that is barred out, to force his *paſſage* into the *communion* of the *Church*, and ſo both ſorts of theſe, continuing out of the *actual communion*, neither the one nor the other be guilty of *ſchiſme* in the leaſt degree by ſo continuing.

Unjuſt excommunication hurts no man.

§. 4. He that is *excommunicated unjuſtly*, cannot be rendred *criminous* by that *misfortune*, nor concluded *culpable* by that argument, upon which he is ſuppoſed *innocent*. Our *Saviour* hath pronounced of the *anathemaes* of the *Jews*, of their bittereſt *execrations*, their πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα, *their ſharpeſt cenſures*, nay the ἀποσυναγωγία, *caſting men out of the Synagogue*, *falſly* or *unjuſtly*, that it is to be looked on as a moſt *auſpicious* token, a matter of the greateſt *rejoicing* to them which fell under it, one of the principal *ingredients* in, and *forerunners* of their bliſſe (and

accor-

accordingly the *Apostles* when they were thus *cast out*, and *contumeliously* used, *went out of the Temple rejoicing that they were thought worthy to suffer shame for Christ's name*) To which purpose is that of *Photius Patriarch* of *Constantinople* to *Michael Metropolitan* of *Mitylene*, *Ep:* 116. Ὥσπερ τοὺς τοῦ δεσπότου μαθητὰς τὸ μισόχριστον τῶν Ἰουδαίων συνέδριον ἀποσυναγωγοὺς ποιήσαντες, ἐκείνους μὲν μᾶλλον τῷ διδασκάλῳ καὶ δεσπότῃ προσωκείωσε, ἑαυτοὺς δὲ τέλεον τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας καὶ τῆς οὐρανῶν βασιλείας ἀλλοτρίωσε, οὕτω καὶ νῦν, &c. *The excommunication of the Jewish Sanhedrim sent out against Christ's disciples brought them so much neerer to their Lord and Master, and alien'd the Jews themselves, removed them so much farther from the kingdome of heaven, and so doth all unjust excommunication now unite us to the Apostles by this conformity with and participation of their sufferings.* And I suppose the *arguments*, and *testimonies* produced by the *Chancellour* of *Paris* are (and, when they were first published, were so deemed by those of the *Romish* communion) unanswerable to this matter; And accordingly that of

Thomas

Thomas de Curſelis in the *Councel* of *Baſil*, that it *was* * *ſaid by Chriſt to the Pope, Whatſoever thou ſhalt binde on earth ſhall be bound, not whatſoever thou ſhalt affirm to be bound,*] hath with it the evidence of undeniable truth, equally applicable to him and all *Biſhops* in that and in all future ages.

* *Papæ à Chriſto dictum, Quicquid ligaveris ſuper terram, erit ligatum, non quicquid dixeris eſſe ligatum.* Jacob: Angularis in Ep: ad Weſſelum ap: Goldaſt: l. 1. p. 575.

§. 5. And then certainly what hath thus been ſaid of the *Formal*, will with the ſame evidence be extended alſo to the *Interpretative excommunication*, whenſoever the *conditions* of the *communion* contain in them any *ſinne*, and ſo become as the former *cenſures* were ſuppoſed to be; For in that caſe certainly it is no act of *Schiſme* from any *Church*, for any *member* to be, or to continue thus *excluded* from it. For how *deſireable*, and valuable ſoever an *intire, inviolate peace* with *all Chriſtians*, with *all men*, (together with the approbation of our willing, cheerful *obedience*, and *ſubmiſſion* of our *judgments* and *practiſes*, to our *ſuperiors*) muſt forever be deemed by all true *diſciples* of *Chriſt*, Yet muſt not the *purchaſe* of this *treaſure* be attempted by the admiſſion

Which holds in the Interpretative Excommunication.

admiſſion of any *ſin*, any more then the *glory of God* might be projected by the *Apoſtle's lie*. The leaſt tranſgreſſion of *God's Law* muſt not be adventured on upon any the moſt *Chriſtian deſigne*, or conſideration; The *peaceable* living with *all men*, which is ſo often exhorted to, and inculcated, is yet no farther recommended, then εἰ δυνατὸν, and ὅσον ἐφ' ἡμῖν, *if it be poſſible*, and *as much as in us lies*, and that, we know, muſt be interpreted of a *moral* and *legal poſſibility*, by which we are pronounced *able* to doe that (and no more) which we can doe *lawfully*, and ſo when the *Apoſtle* 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 11. exhorts to the moſt *earneſt purſuit* of this *bliſful* ſtate, (this *eaſe*, and *reſt*, and *quiet* from the *labours*, and *toils* and *hell* of the *factious*, turbulent ſpirit) it is in a ſtyle, which ſuppoſes this *reſerve*, we muſt, ſaith he, φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν, *have an ambition*, and *emulation*, and *contention to live peaceably*, *and quietly*, obliging us to uſe all means that would be *allowed* to the *ambitious* perſon in his *warmeſt* purſuit, i. e. the *utmoſt lawful*, but not the *loweſt unlawful* means.

§. 6. In

Mr *Knots* Conceſſion in this matter. c. 7. p. 471, 472.

§. 6. In which matter it is remarkable what courſe hath been taken by the *late author of Infidelity unmaſked, in his diſcourſe of the Schiſme of Proteſtants*, where having acknowledged how perfectly *unlawful* it is to *diſſemble*, *equivocate*, or *lie* in the matters of *faith*— and withall urgeing from all *antiquity*, that to forſake the *external communion* of *God's viſible Church* is the *ſin* of *ſchiſme*, he makes a ſhift to *conclude* (as a naturall conſequence) from hence, that therefore the *Church* (I ſuppoſe he means, of *Rome*) is *infallible*, and not *ſubject to errour*, becauſe otherwiſe men might *forſake her communion*— Where though the *conſequence* be very ſtrange, that we may forſake the *Churches communion*, in caſe ſhe be *fallible* or *ſubject* to *errour* (for this ſuppoſes it *lawful* 1. to *forſake* the *communion* of any *erroneous Church*, which is much more then we would deſire to be granted us, and 2. to *forſake* all that are *fallible*, though they be not *actually* in *errour*, which is in effect to forſake the *communion* of all but *Saints*, and *Angels*, and *God* in *heaven*, for they only have the *privi-*

privilege of *impeccable* and *infallible*) yet it abſolutely acknowledges that it would be *lawful* to *ſeparate* from, and *forſake* the (even *Univerſal*) *Church of Chriſt*, in caſe, or on ſuppoſition that we could not be permitted to *communicate* with it, without *lying*, and *diſſembling*, and *equivocating* in matters of *faith*, which he there acknowledgeth to be the *denying God on earth.*

§. 7. Now (to return to our preſent conſideration) Of this there is no queſtion, but that, as it is ſaid to be cuſtomary among the *Kings* of the *Hunnes* (as ſoon as they have any *children*, and ſo no *need* of their *brethrens* aſſiſtance) to *baniſh* all their *brethren* out of their *dominions*, and not to admit them again without *putting out their eyes*, (οὐκ ἔπι ἄλλως τὴν ὀπὴν τῶν χώρων διαβιβλῶ αὐτοῖς ξυγχωρεῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ τὰς ὄψεις ἐκκνίηθεῖσιν, ſaith *Cinnamus*, *Hiſt: l.* 1.) ſo it is *poſſible* (I wiſh it were not juſtly *ſuppoſable*) for a *particular Church* ſo to *fence*, and *limit*, to *guard*, and *reſtrain* their *communion*, to require ſuch ſevere *conditions* of all whom they will *admit*, or tolerate within their *Church*, that ſome

Severe conditions of ſome Churches Communion.

ſome men cannot without *putting out* their *eyes*, or wilful *acknowledgment* of *untruths*, others without *committing ſin* againſt *conſcience*, undergoe the *conditions* thus required, nor conſequently be *admitted* to *communion* with it. As in caſe any unſound or *untrue* poſition be entred into the *Confeſſion*, or *Catechiſme* of any *Church*, and all the members of that *Communion* be *explicitly* required to *believe*, and acknowledge the *truth* of every branch of that *Confeſſion*, and ſo that *confeſſion* be really the *condition*, and accordingly in the reputation of men eſteemed the *teſſera*, or *ſymbol* of that *communion*, then he that ſhall enter this *communion* thus conditionated, muſt certainly either *actually ſubſcribe*, or (which, as to the *ſcandal* of the action, is *equivalent*) be reaſonably *ſuppoſed* to acknowledge that *untruth*; and if in ſome perſons *blameleſs ignorance* may be ſuppoſed ſufficient for the *excuſing*, or alleviating that fault, yet 1. he that hath *means* of *diſcovering* that *untruth*, and criminouſly neglects to make uſe of thoſe *means*, and 2. he that *hath* diſcovered the truth, and yet

Make Communion with them impoſſible.

Such are preſcribing ſubſcription of errors.

yet thus *profeſſeth* himſelf to believe the *contrary*, will not be thus *excuſable*; And it is not here ſufficient to object the ſuppoſable *levity* of the *error*, or intellectual falſity, For how *light*, and inconſiderable (and *extrinſecal* to the *foundation*) ſoever the *error* be ſuppoſed to be, yet if there be *obſtinacy* in continuing in it againſt *light* and *conviction*, or if there be *falſneſs* in *profeſſing*, or ſubſcribing, contrary to *preſent* perſwaſions, or *ſcandal* and ill example, *temptation* and ſnare to others, in *ſeeming* to doe ſo, theſe certainly are *ſins*, and neither *light* nor *inconſiderable*, nor *reconcileable* with that fabrick of *Chriſtian* practiſe, which ought to be *ſuperſtructed* on that *foundation*.

§. 8. Nay if the *errors* be really on the other ſide, if the *doctrines* ſo propoſed, as the *condition* of the *communion* of any *Church*, be indeed agreeable to *truth*, but yet be really apprehended by him, to whom they are thus propoſed, to be *falſe*, and *diſagreeable*, it will even in that caſe be hard to affirm that that man may *lawfully* thus *ſubſcribe*, contrary to

or Profeſſion againſt Conſcience.

his preſent *perſwaſions*; For though it be certain, that he that thus *erres*, be obliged to uſe all probable means to *reform*, and depoſite his error, and, as long as he remains in it, is ſo farre guilty of *ſin*, as he wants the *excuſe* of *invincible ignorance*, and being obliged to *charity* and *peace*, as farre *as it is poſſible*, *and in him lies*, he cannot be freed from *offending* againſt that *obligation*, if he doe not *communicate* with thoſe, the *condition* of whoſe *communion* contains nothing really *erroneous*, or ſinful; and ſo though ſuch a man, on that ſide, be, or may be in ſeveral reſpects *criminous*, yet it is as evident on the other ſide, that he that *profeſſes* to *believe*, what he *really* doth *not* believe, that *ſubſcribes* with his *hand*, what he *rejects* in his *heart*, or that doth that which is under the *ſcandal* of doing ſo, is farre from being *guiltleſs*, he certainly *offends* againſt the *precept* of *ſincerity* and *veracity* (yea and of *charity* to his *brethren*, in reſpect of the *ſcandal*) hath added *hypocriſie* to his *error*, and ſo which way ſoever he turns, he is ſure to *ſin* (the *worſt* and moſt *unhappy* kinde of ſtraight) he remains

remains in *error*, and *ſchiſme* on the one ſide, and by flying from that, he advances to *lying* and *hypocriſie* on the other, and the deſire of *avoiding* one of theſe, cannot *juſtifie* the other.

§. 9. This I ſay, in caſe the *error* be really on the *mans*, not on the *Churches* ſide; But if (as in the caſe propoſed) the *errors* be ſuppoſed to be wholly on the *Churches* ſide, and withall *indiſpenſably* required to be *ſubſcribed* by all, and ſo the *conditions* of that *communion* being exacted of him, who cannot without ſin undertake them, be to him *really*, and *unexcuſably unlawful*, then certainly to that man in that caſe it is no *crime* not to *communicate* (when he is thus *excluded* from *communicating*) with that *Church*, but a *crime*, and a great one, thus (by *teſtifying* againſt the *truth* and his own *conſcience*) to qualifie himſelf for that *communion*. The admiſſion of ſuch guilts as theſe, *hypocriſie*, and *lying* againſt *conſcience*, and due grounds of *conviction*, is too high a *price* to be paid even for *peace*, or *communion* it ſelf.

§. 10. A *meek* ſon of the *Church* of *Chriſt* will certainly be content to *ſacrifice* a great deal for the making of this *purchaſe*, and when the *fundamentals* of the *Faith*, and *ſuperſtructures* of *Chriſtian practiſe* are not concerned in the *conceſſions*, he will cheerfully expreſſe his readineſs to *ſubmit*, or *depoſit* his *own* judgment in *reverence* and *deference* to his *ſuperiours* in the *Church* where his *lot* is fallen. But when this proves *unſufficient*, when *peace* with the *brethren* on *earth* will not be had at a cheaper rate then this of a *voluntary* offending againſt *our father* which is *in heaven*; in this caſe, the *Chriſtian* muſt be content to live without it, and though he would rejoice to *ſell all that he hath* to *purchaſe* that *jewel*, yet his *conſcience*, the *health* and *peace* of that (which is *interrupted* by every *wilful ſin*) is a commodity, that muſt not be *parted* with, whatſoever the *acquiſition* be, which is in his view, and thus offers it ſelf in *exchange* for it.

Application to the Church of *Rome*; in relation to the preſent Church of *England*.

§. 11. The *evidence* of which is, I conceive, ſo *demonſtrative* and irreſiſtible, that it will be juſtly *extended* much

much farther then the preſent caſe of the *Church* of *England* gives me any temptation to extend it; For in caſe our *Anceſtors* had *unjuſtly* and *criminouſly* made a *ſeparation* from the *Church* of *Rome* (which it ſhall anon appear that they have not) and we their *ſucceſſors* in that *ſchiſme* ſhould unfeignedly *confeſs*, and *repent*, and deſire to *reform* that *ſin*, and uprightly diſcharge our *conſcience* in neglecting no means, that *patience*, *humility*, *charity* could ſuggeſt to us, in order to obtaining our *reconciliation*, yet if that cannot be obtained by all theſe *ſubmiſſions*, without that harder *condition* of *renouncing*, or *profeſſing*, or ſeeming (in *common reputation* of men) to renounce any part of *Divine truth*, or *Chriſtian practiſe*, which we verily believe to be the *truth*, and our *duty*, it would not be our *guilt*, but only our *unhappineſs*, that we were thus *forced* to continue in that *ſeparation*. The *reaſon* is evident from the former grounds, we muſt not *ſin*, that we may *give glory to God* (ſuch is *confeſſion*, & *fruits* of *repentance*, *Joſ.*7.19.) a *penitent thief* muſt not *lie*, to enable

himſelf to make *reſtitution*, nor the *contrite ſchiſmatick* commit any *new ſin* (ſuch certainly is *hypocriſie*, *lying*, *profeſſing* contrary to *preſent* perſwaſion) to complete his *repentance* for the *old*.

§. 12. If this laſt be conceived (as it is not the preſent caſe of the *Church* of *England*, ſo) to be an *impoſſible*, *unſuppoſeable* caſe, not only upon the *Romaniſts* grounds, who I preſume will not acknowledge any ſuch *hard condition* (as is the *profeſſion* of an *untruth*) to be required to any mans *reconciliation*, and readmiſſion to their *communion*, but upon this other ſcore, becauſe if any *falſe profeſſion* be now required to our *readmiſſion*, the ſame was formerly required to our continuance in their *communion*, and conſequently our *Anceſtors* departure then could not be ſuppoſed (as in this laſt *fiction* of caſe it is) a *ſchiſmatical* departure. I ſhall not need to give any more diſtinct *anſwer* to this, then 1. That we that acknowledge not the *Church* of *Rome* to be *infallible*, may be allowed to make a *ſuppoſition*, which is founded in the *poſſibility* of her inſerting ſome

ſome *error* in her *Confeſſions*, and making the explicite acknowledgment of that the peremptory indiſpenſable *condition* of her *communion*; 2. That it is *poſſible* alſo (though not by us pretended) that ſhe ſhould ſince that ſuppoſed *departure* of our *Anceſtors*, introduce ſome *new doctrines*, and conſequently ſome *new errors*, and thoſe now be ſuppoſeable to lie in the *way* to our return, though they had no part (before their *birth*) in *driving* us from them; 3. That that may be by the *Church* of *Rome* permitted, and *allowed* to thoſe that have alwaies *remained* in their *communion*, which to them that have *departed*, and either in their *perſons*, or poſterity, deſire to *return* to it, will not be permitted by them; It being more ordinary to indulge *liberties* to *ſons*, that have alwaies *continued* in the *family*, then to grant them to *offenders*, and ſuppliants, that expect *favours*, and *graces*, and *reſtauration* to *privileges*; 4. That thoſe which have had their *education* out of the *Communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, may very poſſibly & probably come to *diſcern* that, which in that *com-*

munion would never have been (for want of *repreſentation*) diſcerned by them, and conſequently may obſerve ſome *errors* in her *doctrine* or *practiſe*, which their *Anceſtors* at their very *departure* from them had not diſcerned, and then though thoſe *errors ſubſcribed* to by them, had the *Lenitive*, or *Antidote* of *blameleſs ignorance*, yet becauſe thoſe that now really diſcern that *truth*, which the *Anceſtors* diſcerned not, cannot lawfully profeſſe *not* to *diſcern* it, or *profeſſe* againſt *conſcience* to *believe* what they doe *not* believe, it is therefore neceſſarily conſequent, that the *return* of ſuch to the *peace* of the *Roman Church* may by this means be rendred *impoſſible* though *their Anceſtors* continuance there, lying under no ſuch *prejudice*, their *ſeparation* were acknowledged *unlawful*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The ſeveral ſorts of Schiſme.

§. 1. THus much hath been neceſſarily *premiſed* for the true notion of *Schiſme*, taken from the *origination* of the word, as that includes, in the *neuter* ſenſe, a *receſſion*, or *departure*, in the *reciprocal*, a *ſeparating*, or dividing *himſelf*.

§. 2. It is now time to proceed and inquire how many *ſorts* there are of this *ſchiſme* in the *Eccleſiaſtical* ſenſe, or by how many waies the *guilt* of this *ſin* of the *fleſh* may be contracted.

§. 3. In which inquiry it will be firſt neceſſary to conſider, wherein *Eccleſiaſtical unity* conſiſts, *viz.* in the *preſerving* all thoſe *relations*, wherein each *member* of the *whole Church* of *Chriſt* is concerned one towards another: Theſe *relations* are either of *ſubordination* (*paternal* on one ſide, and *filial* on the other,) or of *equality* (*fraternal.*) The *unity* of thoſe members that are *ſubordinate* one to the other, conſiſts in the conſtant due *ſubjection*, and *obedience*

Unity Eccleſiaſtical wherein it conſiſts.

Unity of Members ſubordinate.

of all *inferiors* to all their *lawful superiors*, and in due exercise of *authority* in the *superiors* toward all committed to their charge: And the unity of the *fellow brethren* in the performance of all *mutual* duties of *justice* and *charity* toward one another.

Of fellow brethren.

The former.

§. 4. Of the *former* sort is the πείθεσθε ἡγουμένοις, *obedience to the Rulers of the Church*, *Heb.* 13. 17. and back again the ποιμάνειν, due *feeding*, i. e. *governing the flock of God* among them, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. And because there be (under the *King* or *Emperor*, or *supreme power*, to whom *all* are *subject* in any his *dominions*) many possible *links* in that *subordination*, *Patriarchs*, *Metropolitans*, *Bishops*, *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, and the *brethren*, or *congregation*, the *unity* must be made up of the due *subordination*, and *Christian* i. e. *charitative* exercise of *power* in *all* these.

The later.

§. 5. Of the *later* sort there are as many *branches*, as there are varieties of *equalities*. The *brethren* or *believers* in every *congregation*, i. e. all beside the *Governors* of the *Church* (however *unequal* in other respects) are

are in this reſpect *equalized*, and comprehended all under the one title of νεώτεροι the *younger*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5. And this whether we reſpect all other *fellow-members* of the *ſame*, or whether of any *other* congregation, whether *Pariſh*, or *City*, or *Dioceſe*, or *Province*, or *Nation*, of the *Weſt*, of the *Eaſt*, of the *whole Chriſtian* world, as farre as each *member* is qualified to exerciſe any *fraternal* duty toward them. So again the ſeveral *Deacons*, or *Presbyters* of any *Dioceſe*, the ſeveral *Biſhops* of any *Province*, the ſeveral *Metropolitans* of any *Nation*, the ſeveral *Primates* or *Patriarchs* one with another (as the ſeveral *Apoſtles*) over the *whole world*, are each of them to be looked on as *equals* to all others of the ſame ſort; And proportionably (and together with the *Paſtors*) the *flocks*, the ſeveral *communities*, or congregations of *Chriſtian* men conſidered *in complexo*, the *Pariſhes*, *Dioceſes*, *Provinces*, *Nations*, *Climes* of the whole *Chriſtian* world. And according to theſe ſo many *equalities*, there are, or ought to be ſo many ſorts of *unities*, ſo many *Relations* of that *mutual fraternal*

fraternal charity, which *Chriſt* came to plant in his *Church*.

Communion. §. 6. Having ſeen what the *unity* is (to which *Communion* ſuperadds no more but the *relation* of *external aſſociation*, whether by *aſſembling* for the *worſhip* of *God* in the *ſame* place, where the matter is capable of it, or whether by *letters communicatory*, by which we may maintain *external Communion* with thoſe which are moſt *diſtant* from us) It will be eaſie to diſcern what *Schiſme* is, *viz.* the *breach* of that *Unity* (and *Communion*) and what be the *ſorts* or *ſpecies* of it, either thoſe that offend againſt the *ſubordination* which *Chriſt* hath by *himſelf*, and his *Apoſtles* ſetled in his *Church*, or thoſe that offend againſt the *mutual charity*, which he left among his *diſciples*.

The branches of Schiſme as it is an offence againſt Subordination. §. 7. For the firſt of theſe, thoſe that offend againſt the due *ſubordination*, they are poſſibly of as many ſorts as there be *diſtinct links* in the *ſubordination*. As firſt thoſe *brethren* or *people*, which reject the *miniſterie* of the *Deacons*, or *Presbyters* in any thing wherein they are *ordained*, and appointed by the *Biſhop*, (and as long

as

as they continue in *obedience* to him) and of their own accord break off, and *ſeparate* from them, refuſe to live regularly under them, they are by the *Antient Church of Chriſt* adjudged and looked on as *Schiſmaticks*; So *Ignatius* the *holy Biſhop*, (and *Apoſtolical* perſon) and *Martyr of Antioch*, in *Ep: ad Trall:* admoniſhing them to *beware of the poyſon of ſeducers*, i. e. the *Schiſmaticks* of thoſe times, he directs them this one way to doe it, Τῦτο ἔσαι ὑμῖν μὴ φυσιωμένοις, καὶ ἔσιν ἀχωρίσοις θεῦ, Ἰησῦ Χριςῦ, καὶ τῦ Ἐπισκόπυ—— Ὁ ἔνδον ἁγνείᾳ ὢν καθαρός ἐςιν, τῦτ' ἔςιν, ὁ χωρὶς ἐπισκόπυ καὶ πρεσβυτερίυ καὶ διακόνυ φρονῶν τι, ὗτος ὐ καθαρός ἐςι τῇ συνειδήσει, *This ye ſhall doe*, ſaith he, *if ye be not puffed up, and if ye be not ſeparated from God, from Chriſt, from the Biſhop —— He that continues within the ſept is pure, He that dothought without the Biſhop and Presbyterie and Deacon, is not of a pure conſcience*, accounting all that live out of this *obedience* to be ſo far infected and defiled with *ſchiſme*. So again in the former part of the ſame *Epiſtle*, Πάντες ἐντρέπεσθε τῷ διακόνῳ ὡς Ἰησῦ Χριςῦ, ὡς καὶ τ Ἐπισκο- Schiſm againſt the Deacons or Presbyters.

πον

πον ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὄντα υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς Συνέδριον θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς Συνδεσμὸν Ἀποστόλων, χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται, *Let all revere the Deacons as the ministers of Jesus Christ, and in like manner the Bishop as Jesus Christ the son of the Father, the Presbyters as the Senate of God and College of Apostles, without these it is not called a Church.* Where every particular *Church* being administred by these, no man is farther deemed a *member* of the *Church*, then he lives regularly within this *obedience:* And the same is the importance of his exhortation to the *Philippians*, Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ διακόνοις, *Observe the Bishop, and the Presbyters, and the Deacons*, intimating this to be the only way of preserving *unity* against *schisme*, as appears by that which had gone before, Ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ διακόνοις—— ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν πράσσετε κατὰ θεὸν πράσσητε, *There is one altar (or sept) as there is one Bishop together with his Presbyters and Deacons, and the living in union with, obedience to these, is the only way to doe, whatsoever ye doe, according to the will*

of

of God. Where this *ſubordination* being looked on, as that which is placed in the *Church* by *God*, it is both *ſchiſme* and *impiety* not to continue *regularly* under it; And ſo in the *inſcription* of that *Epiſtle*, ὧν ἀσπάζομαι ἐν αἵματι Χριστοῦ, μάλιστα ἐὰν ὦσιν, σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις ἀποδεδεγμένοις κατὰ γνώμην Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *He ſalutes them in the blood of Chriſt, eſpecially if they be at one with their Biſhop, and the Presbyters with him, as alſo the Deacons deſigned by the appointment of Jeſus Chriſt*, looking upon all as *Schiſmaticks*, that were not ſo. Thus again in his *Epiſtle* to the *Epheſians*, he admoniſheth them to *obey the Biſhop, and Presbyters* ἀπερισπάστῳ διανοίᾳ *with an undivided minde*, making the *diſobedience* an act of *ſchiſm* or *diviſion* in any; And ſo generally throughout all thoſe Epiſtles.

§. 8. In like manner; if we aſcend to the *next higher link*, that of the *Biſhop*, to whom both *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, as well as the *brethren*, or people, are obliged to live in *obedience*, the withdrawing or denying this *obedience* in any of theſe will certainly

Againſt the Biſhop.

tainly fall under this *guilt*. So the same *holy Ignatius* in *Ep: ad Smyr:* Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὶ πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, *Let no man without the Bishop doe any of those things which belong to the Church.* Ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, *Wherever the Bishop appears, there let the multitude be,* ὁ λάθρα ἐπισκόπου τὶ πράσσων τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει, *he that doth any thing without the privity of the Bishop, serves the Devil*; the title by which those foule *Gnostick hereticks* and *schismaticks* (the κατατομὴ, the *troublers* and *dividers* of the *Church*) were signified. So in the processe of that *Epistle*, having mentioned *obedience* to their *Bishop*, as a necessary requisite to their *sanctification*, supposing the contrary to be an act of *pollution*, i. e. of the *poyson* of the *schismaticks*, and again admonishing them as of their duty (πρέπει ὑμῖν συντρέχειν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου γνώμῃ) to *concurre with the sentence of their Bishop*, he adds, *that he that doth not* so (expressed by *not* being *within the altar or sept*) ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ θεοῦ, *falls short of the bread of God*, is an *excommunicate person*, being rendred

such

such by this act of *division* from the *Bishop*. So in the *Epistle* to the *Magnesians*, speaking of those that act *without* the *Bishop* (χωρὶς αὐτοῦ πάντα πράσσουσιν) οἱ τοιοῦτοι, saith he, οὐκ εὐσυνείδητοί μοι εἶναι φαίνονται διὰ τὸ μὴ βεβαίως κατ' ἐντολὴν συναθροίζεσθαι, *these seem not to him to be men of a good conscience* (the phrase by which he oft expresses *Schismaticks*, whose *minde and conscience was defiled* by the *poyson* of the *Gnosticks* at that time) *because they assembled not according to that order and establishment which was setled in the Church*. And again, *as Christ did nothing without his Father* (ἡνωμένος ὢν) *being united to him, or all one with his Father*, οὕτως μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ ἐπισκόπου —— *so neither must ye doe any thing without the Bishop*, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχὴ, *but assemble together and have but one prayer common to you all*, where the living out of this *regular obedience* to the *Bishop*, is the contrary to *union* and *communion*, and so is formally *schisme*. And to the *Philadelphians*, ὅσοι θεοῦ εἰσὶν καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗτοι μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰσὶν, *as many as are God's and Christ's, are with the Bishop*, excluding them from the

the *unity* of *Christ's body* who are thus *separated* from the *Bishop*; And in the same *Epistle* speaking of the *repentance* of *schismaticks*, and *hereticks*, and *God's pardon* offered to such, the * *condition* of that *pardon*, and κριτήριον of the *syncerity* of that *repentance*, is, ἐὰν μετανοήσωσιν εἰς ἑνότητα θεοῦ καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, *if they return to the unity of God and senate of the Bishop*. So frequently in S. *Cyprian*, the *schisme* especially of the *five Presbyters* of *Fælicissimus* his *faction*, *Ep:* 40. appears to consist in their *disobedience* to, and *breaking off* from their † *proper Bishop*, and *causing others to doe so*; and *De Unit: Eccl:* the *Schismatick* is described to be *filius impius qui contemptis Episcopis & Dei sacerdotibus derelictis constituere audet aliud altare, an impious son, which having contemned the Bishops, and* (which is all one) *forsaken the Priests of God, dares constitute another altar*; and *Ep:* 76. *qui schisma faciunt & relicto Episcopo alium sibi foris Pseudo-episcopum constituunt, the schismaticks are they that having left their Bishop set up for themselves abroad another false Bishop, and all their adherents*

* Πᾶσιν μετανοοῦσιν ἀφίει ὁ Κύριος.

† *Contra Episcopatum meum* &c. Ep. 40. *Hi tribuebant, ne concordarent cum Episcopo suo-* Ibid. *contra sacerdotium Dei portionem ruptæ fraternitatis armare voluisse.*

adherents are involved in the ſame guilt, qui ſe ſchiſmaticis contra Præpoſitos & ſacerdotes irreligioſâ temeritate miſcuerunt, who joyn with the ſchiſmaticks againſt their Biſhops, and *Ep:* 65. *Hi ſunt conatus ſchiſmaticorum— ut ſibi placeant, ut Præpoſitum ſuperbo tumore contemnant, Theſe are the endevours of ſchiſmaticks, that they may pleaſe themſelves, and proudly contemn their Biſhop,* and *Ep:*69. *Unum ſcire debes— ſi quis cum Epiſcopo non ſit, in Eccleſiâ non eſſe, One thing you are to know that he that is not with the Biſhop, is not in the Church,* the *Church* being there by him defined *plebs ſacerdoti adunata & Paſtori ſuo grex adhærens, the people united to the Biſhop, and the flock to their Paſtor.*

§.9. And as this diſobedience may be of *two* ſorts, either of a *lower,* or of a *higher* kinde, the denying *obedience* in any particular *lawful commaud* of the *ſuperior*, or the *caſting* off all *obedience* together, *dethroning* them, or *ſetting* up our ſelves either in their *ſteads*, or in *oppoſition* to them (the firſt *parallel* to the *contumacy* of the *Levites, the ſons of Eliab, Num.* 16. 12, 14. which ſaid, *We will not come*

This of a lighter & a groſſer ſort.

come up, the *ſecond* to their *rebellion*, *levelling* and equalling themſelves to *Moſes and Aaron* v. 3.) and both together ſubjecting them firſt to that *curſe*, of *Gods*, not *accepting their ſacrifice*, v. 15. and then to that ſudden *exemplary deſtruction*, v. 31.) ſo will the *Schiſme* be alſo a *lighter*, and a *groſſer ſeparation*, a *defection* from the *Biſhop*, and a *rebellion* againſt him, the *former* ordinarily called χίσμα *Schiſme*, the latter στάσις *Sedition*, the latter adding very much to the guilt of the former, and uncapable of the alleviating *excuſes* of *ignorance* or miſtake (in thinking the *commands unlawful*, and conſequently the *obedience*) which may be pretended in the former.

Againſt the Metropolitan.

§. 10. From this of *Biſhops* we may further aſcend to the *higher dignity*, and *authority* of *Metropolitanes*, over *Biſhops* themſelves, which what it is, will be fit to be examined a while.

The original of Metropolitans. In *Titus.*

§. 11. And the firſt riſe may be taken from *Scripture* it ſelf, where the *Commiſſion* which is given to *Titus* by S. *Paul*, to *ordain* Elders, *Tit.* 1. 5. (that is *Biſhops v.* 7.) *in every city* of

of *Crete*, demonſtrates him to have had *Metropolitical authority* beſtowed on him; ſo ſaith S. *Chryſoſtome* (on *Tit.* 1. *Hom.* 1.) of *Titus*, εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν δοκιμὸς, οὐκ ἂν ἀυτῷ τ νῆσον ὁλόκληρον ἐπέτρεψεν, οὐκ ἂν τὰ ἐλλειφθέντα ἀναπληρῶσαι προσέταξεν, οὐκ ἂν τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κρίσιν ἐπέτρεψεν. *If he had not been an approved perſon, in whom the Apoſtle had perfect confidence, he would never have committed a whole Iſland to him, never have appointed him to perfect what he had left imperfect, never have intruſted to him the juriſdiction over ſo many Biſhops:* And *Theodoret in Arg. Ep. ad Tit.* That *Titus* was *ordained by* S. *Paul*, Τῆς Κρήτης μείζους οὔσης τὸς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἐπισκόπους χειροτονῆσαι, *to ordain Biſhops under him for the governing of that whole Province, being a very great one*; and * *Euſebius* τ ὅλη Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι, *That* Titus *had the inſpection of all the Churches in* Crete, of which that there was an *hundred* in number, and *Gortyna* the *Metropolis* of them all, appears by *Dionyſius biſhop of Corinth* about the year of *Chriſt* 175. who inſcribes an *Epiſtle* τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παροικούσῃ

* Eccl. Hiſt. l. 3. c. 4.

κούσῃ Γορτύναν, ἅμα τῶν λοιπαῖς κατὰ Κρήτην ἐκκλεσίαις, *to the Church about* Gortyna, *together with the rest of the Dioceses in* Crete, of all which he mentions and commends *Philip* their *Bishop*, i.e. the *Metropolitan*, under whom they all were, as appears by *Eusebius* l.4. c. ιγ.

In *Timothy*.

§. 12. What hath been thus said of *Titus*, is with the same evidence of the *Text* affirmable of *Timothy*, when being placed by S. *Paul* at *Ephesus* the *chief Metropolis* of *Asia*; he had by that means the *inspection* of all the *Bishops* there, and consequently is directed both for the *ordaining* (1 *Tim*.3.2.) and *exercising jurisdiction* over them c.5.1.19. and so saith S. *Chrysostome*, Δηλὸν ὅτι ἐκκλησίας λοιπὸν ἦν ἐμπεπιστευμένος Τιμόθεος, ἢ καὶ ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, διὸ καὶ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων αὐτῷ διελέγεται. *Tis manifest that Timothy was intrusted with more Churches then one, even with a whole nation, that of Asia, and therefore* S. *Paul discourses to him of Elders or Bishops*, So the *Anonymus writer* of the *Martyrdome of Timothy* ὁ Ἀπόστολος Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου καὶ χειροτονεῖται τῶν Ἐφεσίων

Hom.15. in 1. Tim. 5. 15.

Photii lib. num. 254.

ων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ἐνθρονίζεσθαι. *The Apostle Timothy is ordained by S. Paul, and enthroned Bishop of the Metropolis of Ephesus*, and accordingly is by *Theodoret* styled Ἀσιανῶν Ἀπόστολος *the Apostle, i.e. chief ruler or Bishop of the Asiaticks*; and by *Eusebius*, ὁ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἐπίσκοπος *Bishop of the Province about Ephesus*. *Eccl. hist. l. 3. c. 4.*

§. 13. The same might be shew'd of *James Bishop of Jerusalem*, who by that means was evidently *Metropolitane* of all the *cities* of all *Judea*, And even of *Syria* and *Cilicia* also, if we may argue concludently from the sending of that *Canon* to those *regions*, *Act.* 15. 23. It is likewise the affirmation of *Agrippa* (in *Philo*) of *Jerusalem*, Μητρόπολις δὲ ἐ μιᾶς χώρας Ἰουδαίας ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πλείστων διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας ἃς ἔπεμψεν, *that it was the Metropolis, not only of one region Judea, but of many more, because of the Colonies it had sent out, naming* Συρίαν, Κιλικίαν, *Syria* and *Cilicia* among others. And thereto agrees again (as far as *Syria*) what we find in the letters of *Commission*, which *Saul* had received from the *Sanhedrim* at *Jerusalem* In *James*, &c.

ruſalem, to the *Synagogues* of *Damaſcus*, a city of *Syria*, as being ſuppoſed under that *Metropolis* of *Judea*, Act. 9. 1,2. And accordingly after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, *Tiberias* had this privilege, as appears both by the *Imperial Code*, *tit. de Jud. & Calic.* and by *Epiphanius*, in the *hereſie* of the *Ebionites*, who refers all *Syria* and *Cilicia* to that *Metropolis*, in the ſame manner as the *Synagogues* in *Aſsyria* and *Media* to the *Sanhedrim* in *Bagdat*, and in all *Ægypt* to that in *Alexandria*; But all this doth rather belong to the *Jewiſh Form* among themſelves and the *Jurisdiction* of that *Great Sanhedrim* over their *colonies* thus far diffuſed, and is not ſo appliable to the *Chriſtian Church* at *Jeruſalem*, it being affirmed by *Joſeph. de bel. Jud. l.* 3. *c.* 7. that *Antioch* was *Metropolis* of all *Syria*, but this by the way.

§. 14. Thus *Philippi* appears to have been the *Metropolis* of *one part of Macedonia* (as *Theſſalonica* another) πρώτη τ μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις, *the prime city of a portion, or diviſion,* or *province* of *Macedonia*, *Act.* 16. 12. and is accordingly ſo ſtyled by

Epiſt. 247.

Pho-

Photius the *Patriarch of Constantinople* Ἡ φιλίππων πόλις τῆς Μακεδόνων ἐπαρχίας μητρόπολις οὖσα *the city of Philippi being a Metropolis of a Province of the Macedonians*, and so *Epaphroditus* their *Bishop* in S. *Pauls* time (as * *Theodoret* and others resolve from his being called Ἀπόστολος ὑμῶν, *their Apostle*, *Phil.*2.25.) had under him *many Bishops*, who are accordingly named in the *plural Phil.* 1. 1. and all these *subordinate* to him as their *Metropolitane*.

* τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς προσηγορίαν τοῖς πάλαι καλουμένοις Ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθεσαν, οὕτω φιλιππησίων Ἀπόστολος ὁ Ἐπαφροδίτος ὦν— Theod. in 1. Tim.3.1.

§. 15. So of the *seven churches* of *Asia*, *Rev.*2. and 3. it appears (what hath been elsewhere proved) that they were all *Metropoles*; Of *Ephesus* it hath been already clear, and S. *Chrysostome* is expresse, Ἔφεσός ἐστι μὲν τῆς Ἀσίας μητρόπολις, *Ephesus* is a *Metropolis of Asia*, *and Theod. in Ep. ad Dioscor.* τὴν Ἐφεσίων Μητρόπολιν τῆς Ἀσίας, and in *Photius*, the *Antient* writer of the *Martyrdome* of *Timothy* (*bib. num.* 254.) saith of S. *John*, that being *returned from his banishment* τῇ Ἐφεσίων ὑπέστη μητροπόλει *he resided at the Metropolis of the Ephesians*. And in *Ulpian*, the *Proconsul* under *Antoninus* being to go to

In Arg. Ep. ad Eph.

L. Obser. D. de Offic. procons.

Asia, was to touch upon τ̃ Μητροπόλεων τ̃ Ἐφεσον, *Epheſus one and the chief of the Metropoles of Asia:* and accordingly *Act.* 19. 38. it is ſaid of that city, Ἀνθύπατοί εἰσι καὶ Ἀγορα῀οι ἄγονται, *the Proconſuls were there, and the Aſſiſes, as in the chief city* of that *Province*, and in *Euſebius*, *Antoninus Pius* his *Epiſtle* concerning the *Chriſtians* is ſaid to have been read and proclaimed at *Epheſus* ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τ̃ Ἀσίας *in the common councel* or *conſiſſus* of *Asia*, and in *Ariſtides* it is ſtyled ταμεῖον κοινὸν τ̃ Ἀσίας *the common Magazine of Asia*, καὶ τ̃ς χρείας καταφυγή, *whither they applied themſelves for all their wants.* All which are evidences that it was a *Metropolis* (and the *chief*) of *Asia.*

Eccl. hiſt. l. 4. c. 13'.

Or. ad Aſiat.

§. 16. So of *Thyatira*, ſaith *Ptolomee*, θυάτειρα μητρόπολις that it was a *Metropolis.* Of *Philadelphia* the *Councel* of *Conſtantinople Sub Menâ* Ἐπίσκοπος τ̃ς φιλαδελφείας μητροπόλεως τ̃ Λυδῶν ἐπαρχίας *the Biſhop of the Metropolis of the Philadelphians of the Province of the Lydians*, i. e. in this *Lydian* or *Proconſular Asia.* So *Laodicea*, *Sardis*, and *Smyrna* (together with *Epheſus*) are ſet down by

Geogr. l. 5. c. 2.

Act. 5.

by *Plinie* as *cities* in which the *Roman Proconſuls* kept their *Aſſiſes*, and diſpenſed *juſtice* to all the neighbouring *cities*, which is the *character* of a *Metropolis* in the *civil* notion, and the ſame he alſo affirms elſewhere of *Pergamus*: And thus the whole *number* of the *ſeven Churches* appear each of them, to have been *Metropoles*, and accordingly by *Ignatius* his *Epiſtles* to the *Trallians* and *Magneſians*, (the *Chriſtians* of two neighbour *cities* of *Lydia* on the *Banks* of *Meander*, and ſo of this *Aſia*) and by the mention of their *Biſhops Damas* and *Polybius*, it is evident that there were other *Epiſcopal Sees* in that *Aſia*, beſide thoſe *ſeven* named in the *Revelation*, and thoſe afterward appear to have been *ſubject* to the *Metropolis* of *Epheſus*, which alone of all the *ſeven* continued till *Conſtantin*'s time, the reſt being deſtroyed.

Nat. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 29.

Ibid. c. 30.

Τραλλις πόλις Λυδίας πρὸς τῷ Μαιανδρῳ ποταμῷ *Steph. Byzant.* περὶ Πολ.

§. 17. From theſe manifeſt footſteps of *Metropolitical* power in *Scripture*, it is eaſie to deſcend through the *firſt* times, and find the like; As when *Ignatius* the *Archbiſhop of Antioch* (the *Primitive*

In *Ignatius.*

Martyr) in his *Epistle* to the *Romans* styleth himself τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας ποιμένα, *Pastor of the Church which was in Syria*, that whole *region* belonging then to that *Metropolis* of *Antioch*: Agreeable to which is that of the *author* of the *Epistle* to the *Antiocheni* (whosoever it was) inscribing it Ἐκκλησία θεοῦ παροικούσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, to the *Church of God in Syria, that belongs as a Province to that of Antioch*: So the *Epistle* to the *Romans* is inscribed Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων *to the Church which hath the Presidencie in the place of the Region or Province of the Romans*, which gives the *Bishop of Rome* a *Metropolitical* power over all other the *Bishops* of that *Province*, the *Urbicarian region*, as it was styled, and * *distinguished* from the *Province* of *Italy* properly so called, confined to the *seven Provinces* of the *civil jurisdiction* of the *Vicarius Italiæ*, and the

In the Bishop of Rome. (what his Province.)

* οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν Ἐπίσκοποι. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* l. 7. c. λ. Ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος συναχθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ῥώμης καὶ Ἰταλίας. *Syn. Sardic. Epist. ad Alex. ap. Athan. Apol.* 2. Ἀπὸ μεγάλης Ῥώμης καὶ Ἰταλίας πάσης. *Athan. Epist. ad solit. vit. agent. Ex Provinciâ Italiæ, civ. Med ex Prov. Romanâ, Civitate Portuensi. Syn. Arelat.* 1. *in nominibus Synodo præfixis.*

Ec-

Eccleſiaſtical of the *Archbiſhop* of *Milan* the *chief Metropolis* thereof. Of the *circuit* or *compaſſe* of this *Province* of the *Biſhop of Rome*, many *learned* men have diſcourſed excellently out of the *Antient Surveys* of the *Provinces*, particularly that *very learned Frenchman* ſo rarely skilled, and *judicious* in *Antiquity*, *Jacobus Leſchaſerius*, in his *little tract de Region. Suburbic.* but none with more evidence of conviction, then our *Modeſt* countreyman Mr *Brerewood*, who thus deſcribes the *antient jurisdiction* of the *Biſhop of Rome*, » *that it contained all thoſe Pro-* » *vinces of the Dioceſe of Italy, which* » *the old Lawyers term Suburbicarias,* » *of which there were ten, three Iſlands,* » *Sicily, Sardinia, and Corſica, and* » *the other ſeven in the firm land of I-* » *taly, taking up in a manner all the* » *narrow part of it*, viz. *all Italy* » *Eaſtward, but on the Weſt no farther* » *extended then to the River Magra* » (*the limit of Tuſcanie*) *toward the* » *Tyrrhene ſea, and to the River Eſino* » (*antiently Aſius*) *toward the Adri-* » *atick Sea.* For at that *River Eſino* met both the *Picenum*, *Suburbi-*

carium, and *Annonarium*, the former of which belonged to the *Prefecture* of *Rome*, of which that city was the *Metropolis*, And the later, with all the other *Provinces*, in the *broader* part of *Italy* (*ſeven* of them in all) to the *Dioceſe of Italy*, of which *Milan* was the *Metropolis*. Thus *Ruffinus* in his *Paraphraſe* rather then *tranſlation* of the *Nicene Canon* ſaith, that the *Biſhop of Rome* was thereby authorized *Suburbicariarum Eccleſiarum Sollicitudinem gerere*, to *take and manage the care of the ſuburbicarian Churches*; and there is no reaſon to doubt but that he that lived ſo neer after that *Councel*, and was of *Italy*, knew competently what he affirmed of that matter. And it being evident that in all other places the *Eccleſiaſtical juriſdictions* were proportioned to the *temporal* of the *Lieutenants*, and that the *Suburbicarian region*, and the ſo many and no more *provinces* in them, pertain'd to the *Praefecture* of the *city* of *Rome*, It muſt follow that theſe were the *limits* of the *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* of that *Biſhop* alſo. But this by the way, in paſſing.

Hiſt. Eccl. l.1.c.6.

§. 18

§. 18. So when of S. *Mark* it is affirm'd out of the anc ent records by *Euſebius*, that he Ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον Ἀλεξανδρείας συνεστήσαλο, *firſt conſtituted Churches* (in the *plural*) in *Alexandria*, and under the title of τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίας, *the Province of Alexandria*, put them all into the hands of *Anianus* in the 8th of *Nero*, it is evident that *Alexandria* was a *Metropolitical*, or *Patriarchal See* to which all *Ægypt* did belong. In *Alexandria*. *Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 16. *Ibid.* c. 24.

§. 19. So S. *Cyprian* the *Biſhop* of *Carthage*, to which the whole *Province* of *Africk* pertained, is by the *Councel of Conſtantinople in Trullo*, *Can.* 2. called Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἄφρων χώρας, the *Archbiſhop* of the *Region of Africk*, And accordingly he often mentions the *many Biſhops* in his *Province*, *Univerſis vel in noſtrâ Provinciâ* — *to all the Biſhops in our Province* — *Ep.* 40. And *Latiùs fuſa eſt noſtra Provincia, habet etiam Numidiam & Mauritanias duas ſibi cohærentes. Our Province is extended farther, hath Numidia and the two Mauritania's annexed to it*, *Ep.* 45. in each of which there be- In S. *Cyprian*.

ing a *Church* and conſequently a *Biſhop* in *every city* (as κατ' Ἐκκλησίαν *Act.* 14.23. is all one with κατὰ πόλιν *in every city Act.* 16.4.) they were all *ſubject* to this *Metropolitane.*

The ſubjection of Biſhops to Archbiſhops.

§. 20. By all this, and much more which might be added, it is manifeſt, that as the *ſeveral Biſhops* had *Præfecture* over their *ſeveral Churches*, and the *Preſbyters*, *Deacons*, and *people* under them, ſuch as could not be *caſt off* by any without the *guilt* and brand of *Schiſme*, So the *Biſhops* themſelves of the *ordinary*, *inferior cities* (for the preſerving of *unity*, and many other good uſes) were ſubjected to the *higher* power of *Archbiſhops* or *Metropolitanes.*

Of Archbiſhops to Primates, &c.

§. 21. Nay we muſt yet aſcend one degree higher from this of *Arch-Biſhops* or *Metropolitanes*, to that *ſupreme* of *Primates* or *Patriarchs*, the *diviſion* of which is thus cleared in the *diviſion* and *Notitia* of the *Roman Empire*. *Conſtantine* the *Great* inſtituted *four Præfecti Prætorio*, two in the *Eaſt*, as many in the *Weſt*; Of the *Weſtern*, one at *Rome*, another at *Triers*, this laſt then called *Præfectus Prætorio Galliarum.* Theſe

(Original of Primates.)

Præ-

Præfects had their *ſeveral Vicarii*, who in *their* power, and name judged the *Provinces*, As for example, The *Præfectus Prætorio* placed at *Triers* had *three Vicarii*, or *Lieutenants*, *one* placed at *Triers*, a *ſecond* at *Lions*, a *third* at *Vienna*, from the greatneſſe of whoſe authority, and the reſort of all other *cities* and *Provinces* to them for *juſtice* ſprang the *ſplendor*, and *dignity* of thoſe cities where they reſided, and the dependence of large *Provinces* and many other cities on each of them. This whoſe *circuit* which was thus ſubject to, or dependent on any ſuch *Lieutenant*, was by the *Greeks* called ἐξαρχία, διοίκησις, παροικία, and the ſtyle devolving from the *civil* to the *Eccleſiaſtical* diviſions, as the former both of *cities*, and of *Territories*, and of *Metropoles* or *Mother cities* (the *chief* in every *Province*) had done the *Biſhop* being anſwerable to the *Defenſor civitatis*, and the *Archbiſhop* to the *Præſident* in every *Province*, from thence it came that every ſuch *Metropolis* which was the *ſeat* of any *Vicarius* or *Lieutenant General*, was (over and above Μητρόπολις)

πολις) called Ἐξαρχία and Παξιαρχία, and the *Biſhop* thereof *Primas*, Ἔξαρχος, *Patriarcha*, a *Primate*, *Exarch*, or *Patriarch*, and all that διοίκησις (which is larger then a *Province*, the *joynt adminiſtration of many Provinces*, with the ſeveral *Metropoles*, and *Metroplitanes* contained in it) was ſubjected to him. Thus S. *Ireneus* being *Biſhop* of *Lyons*, is by *Euſebius* affirm'd τὰς κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικίας ἐπισκοπεῖν, *to have the overſight* or *Government of the Provinces of France*, either thoſe only that were under that *Primate*, or perhaps of all *France*, of which *Lyons* was then in the *Eccleſiaſtical* account the firſt *Exarchate*; for ſo ſaith the ſame *Euſebius*, ἧς μητροπόλεις ἐπίσημοι, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἄλλας τῶν αὐτόθι διαφέρεσθαι βεβόηνται Λύγδουνος καὶ Βίεννα, *Lyons*, and *Vienna* (but *firſt Lyons*) *were famouſly known to be beyond all others in thoſe parts, the principal Metropoles of France*. And again Αἱ τῆδε διαφανέσταται, *theſe were the moſt ſplendid illuſtrious Churches there*. To which firſt times I conceive belongs that verſe of *Guilielmus Brito in Philippeide*.

Eccl. Hiſt. l. 5. c. κγ'.

Ibid. c. ά.

Et Lugdunenſis, quo Gallia tota ſolebat,
Ut fama eſt, Primate regi———
placing *all France* under the *Primate* of *Lyons*, or affirming it from *tradition* (*ut fama eſt*) that it was *wont antiently* to be ſo placed, which was not well underſtood or taken notice of by the learned *Joſ. Scaliger*, when he affirms it *nuperum & novitium, & ex beneficio Romani Pontificis indultum, a privilege lately granted to the Biſhop of Lyons by the Pope, quod Primatem ſeſe vocari gaudeat, that he calls himſelf Primate*, which privilege, if not *title*, did ſo long ſince belong to *Irenæus* the *Biſhop* of that *Dioceſe*. *In Notit. Galliæ* p. 852.

§. 22. I ſhall not need inlarge on this ſubject, or ſet down the ſeveral *Primates* and *Dioceſes* belonging to them. It is known in the *ancient notitiæ* of the *Church*, that beſide the *three Patriarchs* of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* (to which title afterward *Conſtantinople*, and *Jeruſalem* were advanced) there were *eleven Primates* more, there being *fourteen Dioceſes*, or *joynt adminiſtrations of many Provinces* (for ſo the word anciently ſignified, not in the modern ſenſe of it, one *city* and the

ter-

The Primates power equal to that of the Patriarch.

territory, the *juriſdiction* of an ordinary *Biſhop*, for which they then uſed παροικία) *ſeven* in the *Eaſt*, and the *Præfecture* of the *city* of *Rome*, and *ſix* more in the *Weſt*, into which the *whole Empire* was divided. And though the *Patriarchs* had in *Councels* the *præcedence*, or deference in reſpect of *place*, either becauſe theſe three cities had the honour to *diſperſe Chriſtianity* in a moſt *eminent* manner to other *cities*, and *nations*, or from the great *dignity* of the *cities* themſelves, (* *Rome* being the *ſeat* and *firſt city* of the *Empire*, and thereupon thus dignified ſaith the *Councel* of *Chalcedon*: and *Alexandria* by † *Dio Chryſoſtome*, and others affirmed to be the *ſecond*, and *Antioch* the *third*, ſaith *Joſephus*) yet it is certain that the *power* and *juriſdiction* of *Primates*, was as great as of *Patriarchs*, and the *Office* the ſame (ſee *Anacletus Epiſt. ad Epiſc. Ital.* and *Gratian Diſt. 99.*) and many times in *Authors* the very titles confounded, as appears by *Juſtinian*, who commonly gives *Primates* the names of *Patriarchs* of the *Dioceſes*. And if it be now demanded whether there

* τῷ θρόνῳ πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀπεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα. *Concil. Chalced. Can penult.*

† *Or. 32. ad Alexandrin.* ſee *Ariſtid. Or. de Rom. Laud.*

there were not anciently some *Summum Genus*, some *one Supreme* either of, or over these *Patriarchs;* I answer, that if we respect *order*, or priority of place again, then the *Bishop of Rome* had it among the *Patriarchs*, as the *Patriarchs* among the *Primates*, that *city* of *Rome* being *Lady* of the *World*, and the *seat* of the *Empire*; But if we respect *power*, or *authority*, there was none *anciently* in the *Church* over that of *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, but only that of the *Emperour* in the *whole Christian* World (as of every *Soveraign Prince* in his *Dominions*) as may appear by the *ancient* power, and practice of *congregating*, or convoking of *Councels*, *Provincial* by the *Metropolitan*, *Patriarchal* by the *Patriarch*, or *Primate*, *National* by the *Prince*, for the first 1000 years, through the whole *West*, and *General* by the *

And no power but of the Prince above them.

* Αἱ μεγίσται σύνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγόνασι γίνονται. *Socrat.* l. 5. *Proœm. Ex Superioribus habetur Imperatores Sanctos congregationes Synodales Universalium Conciliorum totius Ecclesiæ semper fecisse. Ita ego perlustrans gesta omnium Universalium usque ad octavum inclusivè Basilii tempore celebratum verum esse reperi. Cusan. de concord. Cathol* l. 3. c. 16. and c. 13. See S. *Hierom in Apol. ad Ruffin.* l. 2. where speaking of a *pretended Synod*, he adds, *Quis Imperator hanc Synodum jusserit congregari?*

Em-

Emperor, when for the conſerving the *unity*, or taking care for the neceſſities of the *Church*, thoſe laſt remedies appeared ſeaſonable. But this of *General Councils* being *extraordinary*, and ſuch as the *Church* was without them for the firſt *three hundred yeers*, and are now morally impoſſible to be had, we need not farther to aſcend to theſe, but content our ſelves with thoſe *ſtanding* powers in the *Church*, the uppermoſt of which are *Archbiſhops*, *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, to whom the *Biſhops* themſelves are in many things appointed to be ſubject, and this *power*, and *ſubjection*, defined, and aſſerted, by the *Ancient Canons*, and the moſt *ancient*, even immemorial *Apoſtolical tradition*, and *Cuſtome* avouched for it, as may appear *Concil. Nicen.* 1. *Can.* 4. 6. *Concil. Antioch.* c. 9. 20. *Concil. Chalced.* C. 19. In the *Sixt Nicene Canon*, where the *juriſdiction* of *all Ægypt*, *Lybia and Pentapolis* is affirmed to belong to the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and order is taken that the πρεσβεῖα or *privileges* of *eminency* which belong to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, of *Antioch*, and *Metropolitanes*.

The Primitive Power of Primates &c.

litanes of all other *Provinces*, shall be conserved intire to them, the *Introduction* is made in these words, Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. *Let the Ancient customes be in force*, The very form which S. *Ignatius* useth concerning *Apostolical customes* which were to be solicitously retained in the *Church*, and seems there particularly to refer to those orders, which S. *Mark* had left in *Ægypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*, subjecting all the *Bishops* there to the *Patriarch* by him constituted in *Alexandria*.

§. 23. So in the 9th *Canon* of the *Councel* of *Antioch*, where ὁ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστὼς ἐπίσκοπος, *the Bishop presiding in the Metropolis*, is appointed τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας *to undertake the care of the whole Province* (and all the *inferior* cities and *Bishops* in them) and the *Bishops* commanded μηδὲν πράττειν περιττὸν ἄνευ αὐτοῦ, it is straight added κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον κρατήσαντα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα, *according to the ancient Canon of the Fathers, which hath continued in force* (from the *first* times also unto that *Councel*) Where if it be demanded what is the importance of

μη-

μηδὲν περιττὸν, I conceive the word to be best explained by *Hesychius*, περιττοὶ, περισσοὶ περίεργοι (it should doubtlesse be περίεργοι) and so the meaning of the *Canon* to be, agreeably to the expresse words of other *Canons*, that as any *ordinary Bishop* hath full *power* in his *own Church*, which he may in all things, wherein that *alone* is concerned, exercise *independently* from the *commands* or directions of any; So in any thing of a more *forein* nature, wherein any *other Church* is concerned equally with that, and so falls not under the sole cognizance or judgement of either, there the *Bishop* of that *Church* is to do nothing without directions from the *Metropolitane*, and that is the meaning of περιττὸν, as that is all one with περίεργον —— that no *Bishop* must do any thing but what belongs particularly to him *ratione officii* (any thing that another is concerned in, as well as he) without the *Metropolitane*.

Act. 15 *Can.* 9. §. 24. So in the *Councel* of *Chalcedon* the direction is given for *appeals* in this *order*, from the *Bishop* to the *Metropolitane*, from the *Metropolitane*

tropolitane to the Ἔξαρχος or *Primate* of the *Diocese* or *Province*, as where there are more *Metropolitanes* then one (as was shewed of *Ephesus* in *Asia*, and elsewhere frequently) there some one is *Primate* or *Patriarch* among them, and to him lyes the *appeal* in the *last* resort, and from him to no other, see *Justinian Novel.* 123. c.22. and *Cod.* l.1. *tit.*4. *leg.*29. who speaking of this calls it an *ancient* decree.

τῶν Μητροπόλεων πρώτη Ἔφεσος. *Ulp. Obser. D. de Offic. Proconf.*

§. 25. That which we find in the *eighth Canon* of the Great *Councel* of *Ephesus*, shall conclude this matter, when upon some claim of the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* for an interest in the ordaining of the *Patriarch* of *Cyprus*, the *Bishops* of *Cyprus* deny his claim, and deduce their *privilege* of αὐτοκεφαλία or *independence* from any *forein Bishop*, from the very *Apostles* times, *A sanctis Apostolis*, say they, *nunquam possunt ostendere, quòd adfuerit Antiochenus & ordinaverit, vel communicaverit unquam insulæ ordinationis gratiam, neque alius quisquam, From the very Apostles times they can never shew that the Patriarch of Antioch or any other was present*

and

and ordained, or (being *abſent*) *ſent the grace of ordination to this Iſland, but that the Biſhops of Conſtantia,* the *Metropolis of that Iſland,* by name *Trcilus, Sabinus,* and *Epiphanius,* and all the *orthodox Biſhops from the Apoſtles times, ab his qui in Cypro conſtituti ſunt, have been conſtituted and ordained by their own Biſhops of the Iſland,* and accordingly they required that they might *continue* in the ſame manner, *Sicut initio à temporibus Apoſtolorum —— permanſit Cypriorum Synodus, as they had done from the times of the very Apoſtles,* ſtill appealing εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἔθος, ἀρχαίαν συνήθειαν, τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄνωθεν δίκαια, *to the ancient manner,* the *ancient cuſtome,* the *privileges,* which from their *firſt plantation* they had enjoyed, and that from the *Apoſtles* themſelves: And accordingly that *Councel* condemned the pretenſion of the *Patriarch* of *Antioch,* as that which was πρᾶγμα παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς καὶ τοὺς κανόνας τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων καινοτομούμενον, *an innovation againſt the Eccleſiaſtical Lawes and Canons of the holy Fathers, and orders not* only in behalf of the *Cypriots* that the *Biſhops*

ſhops of their *Churches* ἔξεσι τὸ ἀνεπηρεασὸν καὶ ἀβιασὸν— *ſhall continue to enjoy their right inviolate according to the ancient cuſtome*, but *extended* their ſentence to all other *Dioceſes* in theſe words, Τόδε αὐτὸ καὶ ὅπη τῶν ἄλλων διοικήσεων καὶ τῶν ἁπανταχοῦ ἐπαρχιῶν φυλαχθήσεται, ὥστε μηδένα τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐπαρχίαν ἑτέραν, ἣν οὐκ ἦσαν ἀνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτῶν, ἡγουμένων τοῦ αὐτοῦ χειρὸς, καταλαμβάνειν, *The ſame ſhall be obſerved in all other Dioceſes and Provinces whereſoever, that no Biſhop ſhall lay hold of another Province, which hath not been formerly and from the beginning under their or their Anceſtors power.* And again Ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ σώζεσθαι ἑκάστῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀβιασὰ τὰ αὐτῇ προσόντα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνωθεν κατὰ τὸ πάλαι κρατῆσαν ἔθος. *This holy and Oecumenical Synod hath decreed, that the privileges and rights of every Province ſhall be conſerved pure and inviolate, as they have enjoyed them from the beginning, according to the cuſtome that hath anciently been in force.* All deducing this *power* of *Primates* over their *own Biſhops* (and together excluding all *forein* pretenders) from the

the *Apoſtles* and *firſt planters* of the *Churches*, and requiring all to *remain*, as they were *firſt* thus *conſtituted*. Wherein as there be many things of *uſeful* obſervation, which will be more fitly appliable in the *progreſſe* of this diſcourſe, ſo that which is alone pertinent to this place is only this, that there may be a *diſobedience*, and *irregularity*, and ſo a *Schiſme*, even in the *Biſhops* in reſpect of their *Metropolitanes*, and of the *authority* which they have by *Canon* and *Primitive cuſtome* over them, which was therefore to be added to the ſeveral *Species* of *Schiſme* ſet down in the former chapters.

CHAP. IV.

The pretended evidences of the Romaniſt againſt the Church of England examined, and firſt that from the Biſhop of Romes Supremacy by Chriſts donation to S. Peter.

§. 1. THE *Scene* being thus *prepared*, and the *nature* and *ſorts* of *Schiſme* defined and ſummarily enumerated, our method now leads

leads us to inquire impartially, what evidences are producible againſt the *Church* of *England*, whereby it may be thought lyable to this *guilt* of *Schiſme*, And theſe pretended evidences may be of ſeveral ſorts, according to the ſeveral *Species* of this ſort of *Schiſme* deſcribed, and acknowledged by us.

§. 2. The *firſt* evidence that is offered againſt us is taken from a preſumed *Supremacy* of the *Biſhop of Rome*, as *Succeſſor* to S. *Peter*, over all *Churches* in the world, which being in the dayes of *Henry VIII. renounced*, and *diſclaimed*, *firſt* by both *Univerſities*, and moſt of the greateſt and famous *Monaſteries* of this *kingdome* (in their *negative* anſwer and determination of this queſtion, *An aliquid Authoritatis in hoc Regno Angliæ Pontifici Romano de jure competat pluſquam alii cuiquam Epiſcopo extero? Whether the Pope of Rome have of right any authority in the Realme of England, more then any other forein Biſhop hath*) and that *determination* of theirs teſtified under their *hands* and *ſeales*, and after by *Act* of *Convocation* ſubſcribed by the

The firſt charge againſt us, Our caſting out the Popes Supremacy.

the *Biſhops* and *Clergy*, and confirmed by their *corporal oaths*, and at laſt the like impoſed by *Act* of *Parliament*, 35 *Hen. VIII.* c. 1. all this is looked on, and condemn'd, as an Act of *Schiſme* in this *Church* and *Nation*, in renouncing that *power* of S. *Peters Succeſſors* placed over all *Chriſtians* by *Chriſt*.

§. 3. This objection againſt us conſiſting of many branches, every of which muſt be manifeſted or granted to have truth in it, or elſe the objection will be of no force, 1. the matter of *fact*, that thus it was in *England*; 2. the *conſequence* of that *fact*, that it were *Schiſme*, ſuppoſing theſe *Succeſſors* of S. *Peter* were thus ſet over all *Chriſtians* by *Chriſt*. 3. the matter of fact again, that S. *Peters Succeſſors* were thus conſtituted *Univerſal Paſtors* by *Chriſt*; This again of two branches, 1. that S. *Peter* was ſo *conſtituted*, 2. that the *power* inſtated on S. *Peter* devolved on the *Biſhops* of *Rome*; I ſhall endevour to expedite this matter by *granting*, and not requiring the pretenders farther to prove the *two* firſt branches, and leave the iſſue of

of the debate to *their* manifeſting the *truth*, or *our* manifeſting the *falſhood* of (the laſt mentioned, but indeed) the principal *fundamental* part of the contention, as it conſiſts of two branches, one as it reſpects S. *Peter*, the other as it reſpects his *Succeſſor* in the *See* of *Rome*; wherein if the *Romaniſts* pretenſions ſhall appear to have truth in them, we muſt be acknowledged by breaking off from our *ſubmiſſion* to that See, to be formally *Schiſmaticks* according to the grounds allready laid, and acknowledged by us; But on the other ſide, if their *pretenſions* herein ſhall appear to be *falſe*, or unſufficiently proved and manifeſted, there is no other branch of the argument, be it never ſo true, which can give the concluſion any *authority* with any pondering *rational* man, it being in the power of any *weak* link to deſtroy the uſefulneſſe of the whole *chain*, and conſequent to the *falſeneſſe*, or *inevidence* of any *one* propoſition, that the *concluſion* ſhall not be inferred by that *arguing*.

§. 4. And firſt for the pretenſion as far as it reſpects S. *Peter*, and muſt

The Supremacy of S. *Peter* examined.

muſt be managed by *evidences*, and ſo concluded either on one ſide or the other, I ſhall begin with offering my evidences for the *Negative*.

Evidences againſt it. Firſt from his being Apoſtle of the Circumciſion peculiarly.

§. 5 And firſt it is evident by *Scripture*, that this *Apoſtle* was the *Apoſtle* of the *circumciſion*, or *Jewes excluſively* to the *uncircumciſion*, or *Gentiles*, which were generally anothers *Province*; By *Apoſtle* here I underſtand a *Commiſſioner* of *Chriſts*, endued with *authority* by him, and this *Commiſſion* given to him, as to all the other *Apoſtles*, *indefinitely*, and *unlimitedly*, not reſtrained by *Chriſts* words to any particular *Province*, but extending *equally* to the *whole* world; what therefore is done in this kind is by *Subſequent* act of the *Apoſtles* themſelves, who are teſtified to have done that, which it had been very *unskilful*, and improvident, and conſequently *unreaſonable* not to have done, *viz.* *diſtributed* their *Univerſal* great *Province* inro ſeveral κλήρους Ἀποστολῆς *Act.* 1.25. *diſtributions*, or *Lots*, or *leſſer Provinces*, one or more to goe *one* way, the other *another*, which is there called by S. *Peter* πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, *to go to his*

his own, or *proper place*, or *aſſignation*, for the witneſſing the *Reſurrection*, and *proclaiming* the *faith* or *Doctrine* of *Chriſt* to the *world*.

§. 6. Now if the *circumciſion*, or *Jewiſh Chriſtians* were peculiarly S. *Peters Province*, the *lot*, or *diviſion* aſſigned unto him, (agreeable unto which it is, that both his *preaching* in the *Acts* is to the *Jewes* in *Judæa* and *Samaria*, and his *Epiſtles* are *both* of them addreſſed to the *Jewes* of the *diſperſion*, and none elſe) then it is not imaginable, how he ſhould be the *Univerſal*, or *Supreme Paſtor*, or *Biſhop* of the *whole* world: For the *Chriſtians* of that age of the world being either *Jewes* or *Gentiles*, the *Jewes* again either thoſe that *remained* in their *countrey*, or thoſe that were *diſperſed* in *other* regions, there was but one *portion* of one of theſe, which can reaſonably be placed under S. *Peters Juriſdiction*. The *Jewes* that were in *Judæa* were all *immediately* ſubject to the *ſeveral Biſhops* in each *city*, and all they to their *Metropolitane*, *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*; Of this *James* the *brother* (or *neer kinſman*) of *Chriſt*, ma-

ny [a] of the *Ancients* affirm, that he was by *Chriſt* after his *reſurrection* conſtituted *Biſhop* there; [b] others that it was done by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; [c] others the more *ancient*, that the *Apoſtles* conſtituted him in that *See*, *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, the *three moſt honoured by Chriſt*, *conferring this honour upon him*, whereupon in this his *See* he is named *before Peter* and *John*, *Gal.* 2.9. and hath the *Principal* place in the *Councel* at *Jeruſalem*, where S. *Peter* is preſent, and accordingly gives the *Sentence*, *Act.* 15.19. upon which the *Re-*

[a] Ὠφθη Ἰακώβῳ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτῆς καταξιωθέντι ἐπισκόπῳ αὐτοῦ τῶ Ἱεροσολύμων. *Theoph. in* 1 Cor 15.7. *ex Sententiâ Chryſoſtomi.* Ἰάκωβος ὁ πρῶτος ἀρχιερέων, καὶ δεσποτικῇ χειρὶ τὸ ἱερὸν χρίσμα καὶ τὴν ἐφορίαν Ἱεροσολύμων λαχών, *Photius Epiſt.* ειζ'. So *Niſephorus* l. 2 c. 38.

[b] Ἰάκωβος πρῶτος τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν πρὸς αὐτῆς Σωτῆρος καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὑποδεξάμενος. *Euſeb Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 1δ'.

[c] Πέτρον φησὶ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, ὡς ἂν καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς Κυρίᾳ προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπὶ σχάζεσθαι δόξης, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν Δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἐλέσθαι. *Euſeb. ex Clement: Υποτυπωσ.* l. 5. Τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον διαδέχεται ἐκκλησίαν παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίᾳ ὁ Ἰάκωβος. *Hegeſippus* Ὑπομνησ. ἐ. ap. *Euſeb.* l. 2. c. κγ'. Ὃν πρὸς τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὁ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγκεχείρισο θρόνος. *Euſeb.* l. 2. c. κγ'. *vide Athan. in Synopſ. Epiph. Hær.* 78. *Nyſſen. de Reſurr. Or.* 2. *Hieron. in Gal.* 1. & *in Catal. Euſeb. in Chron.* p. 43.

ſcript

ſcript is grounded, *v.* 22. From all which as it appeareth, that the *Juriſdiction* in that *Metropolis* (which had extended very far among the *Jewes*, not only to all *Judæa*, but even to *Syria* and *Cilicia* and other *regions*, ſaith *Agrippa* in [a] *Philo*, as hath formerly been mentioned) belonged to *James* the *Juſt*, and not to S. *Peter*. So it is as evident, that it was not by S. *Peter* alone intruſted to him (which might conclude ſome peculiar *tranſcendent* power of S. *Peter* there) but by S. *James* and S. *John* together with S. *Peter*, which quite takes off all pretenſion of his to the *ſingular Supremacy* there.

[a] Μητρόπολις ὑμᾶς χώρας Ἰουδαίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πλείστων διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας ἃς ἐπεμψεν εἰς τὰς μὲν ὁμόρους, Αἴγυπτον, Φοινίκιλω, Συρίαν —— εἰς δὲ τὰς πόρρω διωκισμένας Παμφυλίαν, Κιλικίαν τὰ πολλὰ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀχρὶ Βιθυνίας καὶ Πόντου ——.

§. 7. So again for the *uncircumciſion* or *Gentile Chriſtians*, they were not S. *Peter's Province* but peculiarly S. *Paul's* (by S. *Peter's* own confeſſion and acknowledgment *Gal.* 2. 7.) who is therefore ſtyled the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, *Rom.* 11. 13. and that without any *commiſſion* received, or

The Gentiles were not S. *Peters* Province.

conſequently *dependence* from S. *Peter*, as he declares and conteſts it, *Gal.*1.12.17. having his *aſſignation immediately* from *Chriſt*, *v.*16. Accordingly whenſoever thoſe *two great Apoſtles* came to the ſame *city*, the one conſtantly applied himſelf to the *Jewes*, received *diſciples* of ſuch, formed them into a *Church*, left them, when he departed that region, to be governed by ſome *Biſhop* of his *aſſignation:* and the other in like manner did the ſame to the *Gentiles*.

§. 8. Thus we know it was at *Antioch*, where S. *Peter* converted the *Jewes*, and S. *Paul* the *Gentiles* (and certainly S. *Paul* no way *Subordinate*, or dependent on *him*, as appears by his behaviour toward him avowed, *Gal.*2.11.) and acordingly in *Ignatius* his *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians* we read of the *Church* of *Antioch*, that it was πεθεμελιωμένη founded by S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, not by *one*, or other, but by *both*, and in the *ancient*, if not *Ignatian Epiſtle* to the *Antiochians*, You, ſaith he, Πέτρε καὶ Παύλε μαθηταὶ γεγόνατε, *have been the diſciples of Peter and Paul*, i. e. *converted* and *ruled* by them, the

the *Jewiſh* part by *one*, and the *Gentile* by the *other*, and the *Church* of the *Gentiles* at *Antioch*, and *Syria* (of which *Antioch* was the *chief city*) and *Cilicia*, is it, to which peculiarly the *decrees* of the *Councel* at *Jeruſalem* are ſent, *Act.* 15. 23. and inſcribed [τοῖς κατ' Ἀντιόχειαν——ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, *To the brethren at Antioch —thoſe of the Gentiles*] and that ſeparately from the *Jewiſh Church* in that *city* or *region*, as is evident both by the contents of that *Reſcript*, or *Decretal Epiſtle*, in which only the *Gentiles* were concerned, *v.* 28, 29. and alſo by that which we read of S. *Peter*, and the *Jewiſh proſelytes*, *Gal.* 2. 11. that they *withdrew* from all *communion* and *Society* with the *Gentile Chriſtians*, upon which S. *Paul reproved* him *publickly v.* 12. According to this condition of *diſparate*, not *ſubordinate Churches* at *Antioch*, it is, that the *writer* of the *Apoſtolical conſtitutions* tells us, that *Euodius* and *Ignatius* at the *ſame* time ſate *Biſhops* of *Antioch*, one ſucceeding S. *Peter*, the other S. *Paul*, one in the *Jewiſh*, the other in the *Gentile*

congregation, and so continued a while, till *both* the *Churches* (the *wall of Separation* being by *compliance* and *Christian Charity* removed) joined, and *united* together under *Ignatius*, who therefore as by [a] *Origen* and [b] *Eusebius* he is called the *Second*, so by S. *Hierome* is called the *third Bishop* of *Antioch*, and yet as truly by [c] *Athanasius* μετὰ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους καταστὰς ἐπίσκοπος said to be *constituted Bishop after the Apostles*, and by [d] S. *Chrysostome* to the same purpose (αἱ τῶν μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χεῖρες——) *that the blessed Apostles hands were laid upon him*, whil'st yet *Theodoret* (ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλου Πέτρου δεξιᾶς) affirms him to have received the *Archisacerdotal honour from the hands of S. Peter*.

[a] *Hom.4.in Luc.*
[b] l.2.c.κβ'.
[c] *de Syn.Arim. & Seleuc.*
[d] *Ex com.Ignat.*

§. 9. The same is as evident at *Rome* where these two great *Apostles* met again, and each of them erected and managed a *Church*, S. *Peter of Jewes*, S. *Paul of Gentiles*. So saith [e] S. *Irenæus*, θεμελιώσαντες καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν—*the blessed Apostles founded and built the Church there*; and [f] *Epiphanius* more expressely, ἐν Ῥώμῃ

[e] l.3.c.3. *Euseb.* l.4.c.6.
[f] l.1.*adv. Carpocrat.*

μὴ γεγόνασι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ὁμίσκοποι, *Peter and Paul were Apoſtles and Biſhops in Rome:* So the *Inſcription* on their *Tombes*, which, ſaith [a] *Euſebius*, continued to his time, mentions them *both* as *founders* of that *Church*. So *Gaius* an *Eccleſiaſtick* writer of great antiquity, *coætaneous* to *Pope Zephyrynus*, ſpeaking of the monuments of S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, calls them [b] Τροπαῖα τῶν ταύτῃ ἱδρυσαμένων ἐκκλησίαν *the monuments of them that founded that Church.*

[a] l. 2. c. xxv.

[b] *Euſeb. Ibid.*

§. 10. So *Dionyſius* the *Biſhop of Corinth*, who lived about 20 years after their *death*, affirms both of the *Church* of *Rome* and of *Corinth*, [c] τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γενομένην, *that it was* (each of them) *the plantation of Peter and Paul*; And [d] *Proſper*, *Petrus & Paulus Apoſtoli in urbe Româ — Peter and Paul the Apoſtles conſecrated or conſtituted a Church in the city of Rome.* And the very *Seales* of *Popes* are an *irrefragable* evidence of the ſame, as they are ſet down by *Mathew Paris* in the year of our *Lord* 1237. *In bullâ Domini Papæ*, ſaith he, *ſtat imago Pauli à dextris crucis in medio*

[c] *Euſeb. Ibid.*

[d] *De Prom. & Prædict: implend: c. 5.*

bullæ figuratæ, & Petri à ſiniſtris; In the Bull of the Pope ſtands the image of S. Paul on the right hand of the Croſſe, which is graven in the midſt of the Seal, and the image of S. Peter on the left hand; and this only account given for S. *Pauls* having the nobler place (*Quia Paulus credidit in Chriſtum quem non vidit, à dextris figuratur*) *becauſe he believed on Chriſt without ſeeing him* (here on earth) And all this very agreeable to the ſtory of *Scripture*, which as (according to the *brevity* of the relations there made) it only ſets down S. *Peter* to be the *Apoſtle* of the *circumciſion* (and of his being ſo at *Rome* we make no queſtion) So it affirms of S. *Paul*, that he *preached* at *Rome* in his *own hired houſe, receiving them which came unto him, Act.* 28.30. which will moſt fitly be applied to the *Gentiles* of that *city*, the *Jewes* having ſolemnly departed from him *v.* 29.

§. 11. Accordingly in *Ignatius, Ep. ad Trall.* we read of *Linus* and *Clemens*, that one was S. *Paul's*, the other S. *Peter's Deacon*, both which afterward ſucceeded them in the *Epiſco-*

scopal chaire, Linus being constituted *Bishop* of the *Gentile*, *Clemens* of the *Jewish Christians* there; And hence growes (unquestionably) that *variety*, or difference observed among writers, some making S. *Peter*, others S. *Paul* the *founder* of that *Church*, but others (as hath been shewed) both of them; some making *Clemens*, others *Linus* the *first Bishop* after the *Apostles*, both affirmers speaking the truth, with this *Scholion* to interpret them: *Linus* was the *first Bishop* of the *Gentile Christians*, after S. *Paul*; *Clemens* the *first* of the *Jewish* after S. *Peter*; and after *Linus* his death, *Cletus* (or *Anacletus*) succeeding him, and dying also, *both* congregations were at length *joyned* in one, under *Clemens*; by which one clew I suppose it easie to extricate the *Reader* out of the mazes, into which the *ancient writers* may lead him, in rehearsing the *first Bishops* of *Rome* so very diversly, but this is not a place to insist on it.

§. 12. By all which it appears, that even in those *Churches*, whereof S. *Peter* is acknowledged the *founder*, as that of *Rome*, and the like, yet he

cannot be deemed the *ſole founder*, but *coequal* to him S. *Paul* of the *Gentile*, as he of the *Jewiſh Proſelytes*: and if the *ſole* government of that *Church* be devolved to the *original*, it will be found to have begun in *Clemens*, in whom the *union* of the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile* congregations there was *firſt* made, and not in S. *Peter*.

§. 13. But then for another great part of the *Chriſtian world*, it is manifeſt that S. *Peter* had never to doe either *mediately*, or *immediately* in the *planting*, or *governing* of it, and conſequently that from him that power can never deſcend to any other. Not to mention the *travailes* and *labours*, and *plantations* of the other *Apoſtles*; which certainly had each their κλήρους and ἰδίους τόπους, and conſequently their *Provinces* by *Apoſtolical* joynt conſent aſſigned them *Act.* 1. (though that *ſhort Hiſtory* written by S. *Luke*, S. *Paul's* attendant, mention them not) I ſhall only inſiſt on the *beloved Diſciple* his *fellow-Apoſtle* of the *Circumciſion*, and that *abundant Labourer* S. *Paul*.

§. 14.

§. 14. For S. *John*, who had the favour of *Christ*, and the *dignity* of place before all others in *Christ's* life time, even before S. *Peter* himself (which is the plain meaning of his style of the *beloved Disciple*, and of the ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ *leaning on his breast at supper Joh.* 21. 20. *his having the* πρωτοκλίσια, *the first place next to Christ*, as being *in Abrahams bosome* plainly signifies being in *dignity* of place next to the *father of the faithful*) 'tis evident that he is one of those that by agreement went to the *Circumcision*, was assigned the *Jewes* for his *Province*, as well as S. *Peter*, and consequently he had the *converting*, and then *governing* of all the converted *Jewes* of that *Lydian Asia*, and placing *Bishops* over them, as [a] *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and [b] *Eusebius*, and [c] *Prosper*, and others tell us; and the [d] *Author* of the *Martyrdome* of *Timothy* saith of him, that being *returned from his banishment by Nerva's decree*, τῇ Ἐφεσίων ὑπέστη μετροπόλει καὶ αὐτὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ, ἔπτα συμπαρόντων ἐπισκόπων τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἀντιλαμβάνεται μετροπόλεως—*he placed his seat of residence*

Nor all the Circumcision.

Not the Jewes of *Asia*,

[a] ὅπου ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων—ὅπου δεξεκλῆρον ἕνα τίνα κληρώσων. *ap. Euseb.* l. 3. c. κγ'

[b] τὰς ὠυτόθι διεῖπεν ἐκκλησίας *Ibid.*

[c] *Joannes apud Ephesum Ecclesiã sacravit. De Prom. & Præd. impl.* c. 5.

[d] *Phot. Bib. num.* 254.

fidence in Ephesus, and having seven Bishops with him he undertook the care of that Metropolis, that is in effect, or by interpretation, of *all Asia,* which was under that *prime Metropolis,* as far as extended to the *Jewish Christians* there.

As neither the Gentiles there.

§. 15. But then as before was said of the several *Churches* and *Bishops* in the same place, one of the dispersed *Jewes,* the other of *Gentiles;* so it is evident that through all this *Asia* (the *Lydian* or *Proconsular*) the *faith* was by S. *Paul* planted among the *Gentile* part, and by him S. *Timothy* constituted *Bishop* there: and so saith S. *Chrysostome,* Ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐμπιστευθὲν αὐτῷ, *a whole intire nation, that of Asia was intrusted to him.*

Hom. 5. in 1 Tim. 5. 19.

§. 16. Where I shall demand of any man of the *Romish* pretensions, or perswasion, what can be said, in any degree probably, for S. *Peters Universal Pastorship,* whilst he lived, over this *Asia,* whose *seven Metropoles* (and sure there were *inferior Churches*, or *Episcopal* Sees under them) are so early famous, being honoured with *Christs Epistle* to them

in

in the *Revelation*; was S. *Peter* the *ſupreme Paſtor* of theſe *Churches*? had he any, or did he ever exerciſe, or pretend any *Juriſdiction* over them? was not all the *Jewiſh* part of that *Province* ultimately under S. *John*? and the *Gentile* part under S. *Paul*, and S. *Timothy* conſtituted, and *commiſſionated* by him? Doth not S. *Paul* give him full *inſtructions* (and ſuch as no other *Apoſtle* could countermand, or interpoſe in them) leaving no other *appeal* or place of application for *farther* directions, ſave only to *himſelf*, when he ſhall *come to him*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15. Did not S. *Paul* by his own ſingle power *delegate* that *Province* to *him*, and ſeat him there? (as appears by the παρεκάλεσα πορεύομενος, *I exhorted* or *appointed thee, when I went to Macedonia*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3.) and may it not as reaſonably be ſaid that S. *Peter* was with him in his *journey* to *Macedonia*, as that he *joyned* with him in *giving* that *Commiſſion* to *Timothy*?

§. 17. And ſo likewiſe of *Titus* in *Crete*, was he not by S. *Paul* peculiarly left in *Crete*, and conſtituted *Primate* there? Is it imaginable that

Nor in *Crete*,

that under *Christ* there could be any *head* of that *Church* of that whole *Island*, save only S. *Paul*?

Nor in *Britannie.*

§. 18. The same may certainly be said of all the *Gentile Churches* in all other *Islands*, and parts of the world, and consequently in this of *Britannie*, wherein our present debate is terminated: And therefore if that of * *Simeon Metaphrastes* should be thought to have truth in it, that S. *Peter* was in *Britannie* some time and *baptized* many into the *faith* of *Christ*, and *constituted Churches, ordaining Bishops* and *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the 12. of *Nero*, in all reason it must be extended no farther then S. *Peters line*, as he was the *Apostle* of the *Circumcision*, i. e. to the *Jewes* that might at that time be *dispersed* here, and so not prejudge the other more *authentick* relations, of *Joseph* of *Arimathea* or *Simon Zelotes* having *planted* the *faith* in this *Island*.

* *de Petr: & Paul: ad diem 29. Junii.* Ἐπιμείνας ἐν Βρεταννίᾳ ἡμέρας τινας, καὶ πολλὰς τῷ λόγῳ φωτίσας τὸ χάειτος ἐκκλησίας τε συνεζάμωσε, ἐπισκόπους τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους χειροτονήσας, διωδεκάτῳ ἔτει τοῦ Νέρωνος.

§. 19.

§. 19. This I ſuppoſe is one competent *proof* of the *Negative*, as it reſpects the perſon of S. *Peter*, that he was not (*could* not be, as things ſtood with him) *Univerſal Paſtor* of the *whole Church*, conſtituted by *Chriſt*. And accordingly we ſee in *Proſper* diſputing againſt *hereticks*: which *divide* from the *Church*, he expreſſes it by *relictâ pace communionis, & panis unius Dei & Apoſtolorum*, *that they leave the Communion of Chriſt and his Apoſtles* in the *plural*, and adds *cum in ipſâ Hieruſalem Jacobus— Joannes apud Epheſum, Andreas & cæteri per totam Aſiam, Petrus & Paulus Apoſtoli in urbe Româ, Gentium Eccleſiam pacatam unámque poſteris tradentes, ex Dominicâ pactione ſacrarunt*, that *James* in *Jeruſalem*, *John at Epheſus*, *Andrew and the reſt through all Aſia*, *Peter and Paul at Rome conſecrated the Church of the nations*. Whereas the *Church* had the ſeveral *Apoſtles* for the *founders* (and thoſe *independent* one from the other) So the *unity* from which *hereticks*, and *ſchiſmaticks* depart, is ſaid to have been *founded* equally in each of them, in *John* and

Proſpers teſtimony to this matter.

and *James* and *Andrew* and others, as well as in S. *Peter*, nay at *Rome*, not in S. *Peter* alone, but in him and S. *Paul*, together.

A ſecond evidence againſt S. *Peters* ſupremacy from the donation of the keyes.

§. 20. In the *next* place another *evidence* we may have of this (in reference again to S. *Peters* perſon) from that which is viſible in the *donation* of the *power* of the *Keyes* ſet down in *Scripture*. This *power Mat.* 16. 19. is promiſed to S. *Peter*, [*I will give unto thee the keyes of the kingdome of heaven, and whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth ſhall be bound in heaven*——] But to him that from hence pretends this *Donative* and conſequent *power*, as a *peculiarity* and *incloſure* of S. *Peters*, theſe conſiderations will be of force to ſuperſede his *concluſion*, 1. That theſe words here ſet down by S. *Matthew*, c. 16. are not the *Inſtrument* of *Chriſts conveyance*, the words of his *commiſſion*, but thoſe *other Joh.* 20. 21. *As my Father hath ſent me, ſo ſend I you*, upon which words it is added, he *breathed on them, and ſaid, Receive the holy Ghoſt, Whoſe ſins you remit, they are remitted*—— And theſe (as alſo thoſe *Mat.* 28. 19. which are a

Power of the keyes given to all and each.

repetition

repetition much to the ſame purpoſe) are delivered in *common*, and equally to *all*, and every of the *eleven Apoſtles*, as is evident by the *plural* ſtyle throughout that *Commiſſion*.

§. 21. Secondly, The words *Mat.* 16. are only a *promiſe* in the *future*, what *Chriſt* will afterward do, and ſo the *donation* there ſet down only by way of προλήψις, or *anticipation*, and if the making this *promiſe* to him peculiarly, ſeem to make any thing for him, then the *repetition* of that *promiſe*, *Mat.* 18. 18. which is made to *all* the *Apoſtles indefinitely* will *take* off that appearance, where it is λέγω ὑμῖν, and, ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε, *I ſay unto you* (to *all* of them *equally* and without any *peculiarity* of reſtriction) *whatſoever ye ſhall bind &c.* The applying the words particularly to S. *Peter* hath one ſpecial *energie* in it, and concludes that the *Eccleſiaſtical* power of *œconomy* or *ſtewardſhip* in *Chriſt's houſe* (of which the *keyes* are the *token Iſa.* 22. 21.) belongs to *ſingle* perſons, ſuch as S. *Peter* was, and not only to *Conſiſtories*, or *aſſemblies*, that whatſoever S. *Peter* acted by virtue of *Chriſts* power thus promiſed,

promiſed, he ſhould be fully able to *act himſelf*, without the *conjunction* of any other, and that what he thus did (*clave non errante*) no one (or more men) *on earth* could reſcind *without him*, which is a juſt ground of placing the *power Eccleſiaſtical* in *Single perſons*, and not in *Communities*, in the *Prelate* of *each Church*, and not in the *Presbytery*. But ſtill this is no *confining* of this *power* to S. *Peter*, any more then to any other *ſingle Apoſtle*, who had this *power* as diſtinctly *promiſed* to *each* of them, as here S. *Peter* is pretended, and acknowledged to have; To which purpoſe, as the words of *Scripture* are moſt clear *Mat.*18.18. (and accordingly *Mat.* 19. the *promiſe* is again made of *twelve thrones* for *each Apoſtle* to ſit on *one*, to *judge*, i. e. to *rule*, or *preſide* in the *Church*, and when that *promiſe* was finally performed in the *deſcent* of the *Spirit*, *Act.*2. the *fire* that repreſented that *Spirit* was *divided*, and ἐκάθισεν *ſat upon every one of them*, without any peculiar *mark* allowed S. *Peter*, and *they were all filled with the holy Ghoſt*, and ſo this *promiſe equally performed*,

as

as it was *made*, to *all*) ſo is this exactly the notion, which the *ancient Fathers* of the *Church* appear to have had of them; Thus *Theophylact* according to S. *Chryſoſtomes* ſenſe, Εἰ καὶ πρὸς Πέτρον μόνον εἴρηται, τὸ, [Δώσω] σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις δέδοται, *Though the words* [*I will give thee*] *were delivered to S. Peter alone, yet the power hath been conferred on all the Apoſtles.* *in Mat.* 18. S. *Cyprian* hath an *eminent* place to this purpoſe, *Dominus noſter*—— *Epiſcopi honorem & Eccleſiæ ſuæ rationem diſponens in Evangelio loquitur, & dicit Petro, Ego tibi dico, Quia tu es Petrus, & tibi dabo claves*——— *Inde per temporum & ſucceſſionum vices Epiſcoporum ordinatio & Eccleſiæ ratio decurrit, ut Eccleſia ſuper Epiſcopos conſtituatur, & omnis actus Eccleſiæ per eoſdem gubernetur, Chriſt meaning to ſet down the way of ordering his Church, ſaith unto Peter, I will give thee the keyes*—— *From this promiſe of his, the ordination of Biſhops and courſe of the Church hath continued by all ſucceſſions and viciſſitudes, So that the Church is built upon Biſhops* (in the *plural*) *and every Eccleſiaſtick act is governed by them.* *Epiſt.* 27.

So

De Dign. Sacerd. c. 5. & 6.

So S. *Ambrose, Claves illas regni Cœlorum in beato Petro cuncti suscepimus Sacerdotes, All we Bishops have in S. Peter received those keyes of the kingdome of heavens.* And accordingly S. *Athanasius* mentions the *office* of *Bishop* as one of those things ἃ ὁ κύριος διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων τετύπωκε, *which Christ effigiated or formed in or by the Apostles*; And S. *Basil* the *great* calls *Episcopacy* προεδρίαν τῶν Ἀποστόλων, *the Presidency of the Apostles*, the very same, that *Christ* bestowed upon *all*, and not only on *one* of them.

Ep. ad Dracont.

§. 23. By all which it is evident again, that the *power* which *Christs commission* instated on S. *Peter*, was in like manner intrusted to every other *single Apostle*, as well as to him, and consequently that this of *universal Pastor* was no *personal* privilege, or *peculiarity* of S. *Peters*.

The Romanists argument from *Tu es Petrus* evacuated.

§. 24. Thirdly, that argument which is taken by learned Romanists from the name of *Peter* [Πέτρος a *Rock* or *foundation stone*] bestowed on him by *Christ*, as if that were sufficient to *found* this pretended *Supremacy*, is presently *evacuated*, and re-

retorted on the pretenders, when 'tis remembred 1. that Πέτρος, and Πέτρα, directly the same, signifies vulgarly *a stone* (μολοείδεϊ Πέτρῳ, in *Homers Iliad.* ή.) and of it self denotes no more, but by the *context*, *Mat.* 16.18. being applied to a *building* must needs signifie a *foundation stone*; and then 2. that *all* the 12 *Apostles* are in like manner (and not *he only*, or *above* any other) styled θεμέλιοι δώδεκα, *twelve foundations Apoc.*21.14. each of which *stones* having the name of an *Apostle* on it, in respect of the *power*, and *dignity* that belonged to every one, is severally compared to a *precious stone*; And it being there in *vision* apparent, that the *wall* of the *city*, i.e. of the *Church*, being measured exactly, and found to be an *hundred fourty four*, i. e. *twelve times twelve cubits*, 'tis evident that that mensuration assignes an *equal* proportion whether of *power* or *province* to *all* and *every* of the *Apostles* which is again a *prejudice* to the *Universal Pastorship* of any one of them.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The Evidences from the Biſhop of Romes ſucceeding S. Peter examined.

No privilege by ſucceſſion from S. *Peter*, but ſuch as S. *Peter* is proved to have himſelf.

§. 1. FRom this argument of the pretenders as it reſpects S. *Peters perſon*, and hath thus been manifeſted to be utterly incompetent to inferre the deſigned *concluſion*, It is now very eaſie, but withall very unneceſſary to proceed to the other part of it, as it concerns S. *Peters ſucceſſors* in his *Epiſcopal*, or (which is all one as to this matter) his *Apoſtolical* ſeat, and power at *Rome*, For certainly what he had not *himſelf*, he cannot *devolve* to any of his *ſucceſſors* upon that one skore of *ſucceeding* him, and therefore as this of S. *Peters perſonal* power, and eminence is the *principal*, So it is in effect the *only* ground of the *Romaniſts* pretenſion, this other of *derivative* power in his *ſucceſſor*, being like water that flowes from a *ſpring*, apt to *aſcend* no higher, then the *fountain* ſtood, and therefore I again think fit to remind the *Romaniſt*, and perem-

remptorily to inſiſt on this *exception*, that if he cannot make good S. *Peters Oecumenical* power, and *Paſtorſhip* over *all* the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, from the *donation* of *Chriſt* (which I ſuppoſe hath been evidenced he cannot do, and for any proofs made uſe of by any to that purpoſe, and drawn either from *Feed my ſheep*, and *lambs*, or from the mention of the *two ſwords*, or from *Thou art Peter*—— they have ſo little apparence of ſtrength in them, and have ſo *often* been anſwered by thoſe of *our* perſwaſion, that I cannot think it uſeful, or ſeaſonable to deſcend to any *farther* ſurvey of them) his other pretenſions are at an end for the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of the *Pope* his *ſucceſſor*, whoſe *power*, and *authority* over all other *Biſhops* cannot farther be extended (upon this account of *ſucceſſion*) then S. *Peter's* was over all other *Apoſtles*, the ſeveral *Biſhops* of the world *holding from* (as *ſucceeding*) ſome *Apoſtle* or other, as certainly as the *Biſhop* of *Rome* can by any be ſuppoſed to *ſucceed S. Pe-*
Peter, according to that of * *Tertul-* * De Præſcript.
lian, Sicut Smyrnæorum Eccleſia Po- c. 32.
lycarpum

lycarpum à Joanne collocatum refert, Sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit, perinde utique & cæteræ exhibent quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatum conſtitutos Apoſtolici ſeminis traduces habent, As the records of the Church of Smyrna deduce Polycarp their Biſhop from S. John, and as the Church of Rome relates that Clement (their Biſhop) was ordained by S. Peter, in like manner the reſt of the Churches ſhew us the Biſhops which they have had conſtituted by the Apoſtles, and who have brought down and derived the Apoſtolick ſeed unto them.

§. 2. What therefore I ſhall now adde in return to the *ſecond branch* of this *argument*, concerning the *power* of S. *Peters ſucceſſor*, as ſuch, will be perfectly *ex abundanti*, *more then* needs, and ſo I deſire it may be looked on by the reader, whoſe *curioſity* perhaps may require farther *ſatisfaction*, when his *reaſon* doth not, and in *compliance* therewith I ſhall propoſe theſe few *conſiderations*. * Firſt whether S. *Peter* did not as truly *plant* a *Church* of *Jewiſh believers* at *Antioch*, and leave a *ſucceſſor* Bi-

* The privileges attending S. *Peters* ſucceſſor belonging rather to the Biſhop of *Antioch* then of *Rome*.

Biſhop there, as at *Rome* he is ſuppoſed to have done? 2. Whether this were not done by him, before ever he came to *Rome*? 3. Whether the *Conceſſion* of theſe *two* unqueſtioned matters of *fact*, doe not *devolve* all *power*, and *Juriſdiction* on the *Biſhop* of *Antioch S. Peters ſucceſſor* there, which by that tenure and claim of *ſucceſſion* from *S. Peter* can be pretended to by the *Biſhop of Rome, S. Peters ſucceſſor* alſo? Nay, Whether the *right* of *Primogeniture* be not ſo much more conſiderable on this ſide, then any circumſtance on the other ſide, which can be offered to *counterbalance* it, that he which *ſucceeded* him in his *firſt ſeat* (*Antioch*) is, if there be force in the *argument* of *ſucceſſion*, to be looked on as the *chief of his ſtrength*, partaker of *more power* by *virtue* of that *ſucceſſion*, then he that afterward *ſucceeded* him at *Rome*?

§. 3. This we know, that *anciently* there were *three Patriarchates*, and *Antioch* was one of them, as *Rome* was another; and though I, who lay not that weight on the *argument* of *ſucceſſion* from *S. Peter*, am not en-

gaged to affirme that *Antioch* was the *chief* of theſe, yet this I contend, that there is much leſſe reaſon, that any *precedence*, which is afforded *Rome* by the *ancient Canons*, ſhould be deemed imputable to this *ſucceſſion* from *S. Peter*, when 'tis evident that claim belongs to *Antioch*, as well as to *Rome*, and *firſt* to *Antioch*, and afterwards to *Rome*, and no otherwiſe to *Rome*, then as it was firſt competible to *Antioch*.

The Primacy belonged to *Rome* upon another ſcore.

§. 4. Of *Rome* it is confeſſed that the *primacy* of *dignity* or *order* belonged to that, the *next* place to *Alexandria*, the *third* to *Antioch*, which is an evidence that the *ſucceſſion* from *S. Peter* was not conſidered in this matter, for then *Alexandria*, which held only from *S. Mark*, muſt needs have yeelded to *Antioch* which held from *S. Peter*. The original of this *precedence*, or *dignity* of the *Biſhop of Rome* is ſure much more fitly deduced by the *fourth General Councel* holden at *Chalcedon*, confirming the *decree* of the *Councel of Conſtantinople*, that that *See* ſhall have ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal privileges*, and *dignities*, and *advantages* with *Rome*, upon this

Can. penult.

this account, that *Constantinople* was *New Rome*, and the *seat* of the *Empire* at that time; which, say they, was the *reason* (and not any *donation* of *Christs* to *S. Peter*, or *succession* of that *Bishop* from him) that *Rome* enjoyed such *privileges* (Καὶ γὰρ τὸ θρόνῳ πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως δεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα) and therefore τῷ αὐτῷ σκόπῳ κινούμενοι, *The Fathers at Constantinople being moved with the same reasons had rightly judged that now the same privileges should belong to that Church or City*, Καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι δευτέρην μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν, and that this being next to *Old Rome* should in all *Ecclesiastical affaires* have the *same dignity*, or *greatnesse* that *Old Rome* had. Where, as the *Original* of the *dignity* of that *See* is duly set down, and (which is observable) in the whole *contest* never so much as quarelled at by the *Legats*, *viz.* the *residence* of the *Imperial Majesty* there (a thing very remarkable in the several degrees of dignity in the *Church*, that of *Patriarchs*, *Primates*, *Archbishops*, *Bi-*

shops, which generally observed their proportions with the *civil state*, as hath been shewed) so is the nature of it also, no *supremacy* of *power* over all the *Bishops* of the *world* (for that *monarchical* power is not at once competible to two *equals* or *rivals*) and withall the *moveablenesse* or *communicablenesse* of that *dignity*, as that which may follow the *Imperial seat*, whithersoever it is *removeable*, and is not fixed at *Rome* by any *commission* of *Christ* or *succession* from *S. Peter*.

The Canon of the Councel of *Chalcedon* rejected by the *Romanists*.

§. 5. But because I shall suppose that a *Canon*, though of an *Universal Councel*, when it is found thus derogatory to the *height* which *Rome* now pretends to, shall not by the *Romanist* be acknowledged to be *authentick*, as wanting that which the *Romanist* makes absolutely necessary to the validity of *Councels* or *Canons*, the *suffrage* of the *Bishop* of *Rome* and consent of his *Legates*; and because I mean not here to goe out of my way to vindicate (which I could very readily doe) the *authority* of that *Canon*, or to shew the strangenesse of this dealing, not to admit any *testi-*

mony

mony againſt them, but wherein they have given their *own ſuffrage* (a method of *ſecurity* beyond all *amulets*, if no man ſhall be *believed* againſt me, till I have *joyned* with him to *accuſe* and *condemne* my *ſelf*) I ſhall therefore lay no more weight on this, then will, without this ſupport, be otherwiſe upheld, and is in ſome meaſure evident by the *Romaniſts* rejecting this *Canon*, and adding that the *Church* of *Antioch* rejected it alſo; which argues that that which the *Church of Conſtantinople* was willing to acquire by this decree, was as derogatory to the *dignity* of *Antioch* as of *Rome*. And as that concludes that *Antioch* had profeſſedly the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges* with *Rome*, the *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, and the attendants and *pompes* of that, So it proceeds on a *conceſſion*, that all that *Conſtantinople* wanted, or in which this *New* came ſhort of the *Old Rome*, was only the *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, without any *ordinary juriſdiction* over other *Churches*. Which again ſhewes us what was the nature of the *preeminence* of the *Roman See* at that time; no *ſupreme*

The dignity of Patriarchs reconcileable with the independency of Primates.

authoritative power over other *Primates*, but only a *precedence*, or *priority* of place in *Councels*, an *eminence* in respect of *dignity*, which is perfectly reconcileable with the ἀυτονομία and *independence*, the *no-subordination* or *subjection* of other *Primates*.

The Canon of *Ephesus* against encroaching on any others *Province*.

§. 6. This hath *formerly* been manifested, when we discoursed of the *original*, and *power*, and *dignity* of *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, and is put beyond all controll by that *Canon* of the *Councel* of *Ephesus* in the cause of the *Archbishop* of *Cyprus*, over whom the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, though *Patriarch* of *all* the *Orient*, was adjudged to have no manner of *power*. And this *independency* of *Cyprus*, not only from the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, but from *all* others whomsoever, was contested then, as from the *Apostles* times, and asserted, and vindicated by that *Councel*, and order given *indefinitely* against all invasions for time to come, in whatever *Diocese*, that no *Bishop* shall encroach upon *anothers Province*, or usurp a *power*, where from the *Apostles* times he had not *enjoyed* it; which how directly it (is applicable to, and) *prejudgeth* the pre-

pretensions of *Rome*, as well as of *Antioch*, is so manifest, that it cannot need farther demonstrating.

§. 7. Of the same kind, two farther instances I shall here adde; first of the *Archbishop* of *Carthage*, who being the *chief Primate*, or *Metropolitan* (for these two words in the *African* style, different from the usage of other *Churches*, are observeable to signifie the same thing) in *Africk*, i. e. in one of the *thirteen Dioceses* of the *Empire*, appears to have been *independent* from all other *power*, an absolute *Primate*, subject to no *superiour*, or *Patriarch*, whether of *Alexandria*, or *Rome*. This is evident by *Justinian* in the 131 *Novel*, where the *Emperour* gives the same privileges to the *Archbishop* of * *Carthage*, which he had formerly given to the *Bishop* of *Justiniana prima*; which being the *second example* I meant to mention, I shall briefly shew what that *Prerogative* was, which equally belonged to these two.

Instances of Independent power in Archbishops.

* Καὶ τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τὸ δίκαιον τῆς Ἀρχιεροσύνης ὅπερ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς Ἰουστινιανῆς Καρχηδόνος τὸν Ἀφρικῆς διοικήσεως δεδώκαμεν, ἐξ οὗπερ ὁ θεὸς ταύτην ἡμῖν ἀποκατέστησε φυλάττεσθαι κελεύομεν.

§. 8. *Juſtiniana Prima* was the head of [a] *Dacia* the new; a *Dioceſe* (as that ſignifies *more* then a *Province*, a [b] *Primat's*, a *Patriarch's* dominion) erected by *Juſtinian the Emperour*; and that city thus dignified, as the [c] place where he had been *born*, and the *Archbiſhop* thereof made *Primate* of all that *Dioceſe*. This is thus expreſſed in the *Imperial Conſtitutions*, *Nov.* 11. *that he ſhall have omnem cenſuram Eccleſiaſticam, ſummum Sacerdotium, ſummum faſtigium, ſummam dignitatem, all power of Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, the ſupreme Prieſthood, ſupreme honour and dignity*; And in the *Conſtitutions* ſet out by *Gothofred* out of an *old*

[a] *Cæteræ Provinciæ ſub ejus ſint authoritate*, i. e. *tam ipſa mediterranea Dacia, quàm Dacia Ripenſis, nec non Myſia, Secunda Dardania, & Prævalitana Provincia & ſecunda Macedonia, & pars ſecunda etiam Pannoniæ, quæ in Bacenſi eſt civitate. Juſtin: de Privileg: Archiep: Juſt: Prim: ed: à Gothofred:* [b] *Volumus ut Primæ Juſtinianæ patriæ noſtræ pro tempore ſacroſanctius Antiſtes, non ſolùm Metroplitanus, ſed etiam Archiepiſcopus fiat.* Ibid. [c] *Multis & variis modis noſtram patriam augere cupientes, in qua Deus præſtitit nobis ad hunc modum* (So *Gothofred* reads, but certainly it ſhould be *ad*, or *in hunc mundum*) *quem ipſe condidit, venire.* Ibid. *Neceſſarium duximus ipſam glorioſiſſimam Præfecturam, quæ in Pannoniâ erat, in noſtrâ fœliciſſimâ patriâ collocare.* Ib.

MS.

MS. Copy, Tu & omnes Juſtinianæ primæ Antiſtites, quicquid oriatur inter eos diſcrimen, ipſi hoc dirimant, & finem eis imponant, & nec ad alium quendam eatur, ſed ſuum agnoſcant Archiepiſcopum omnes prædictæ Provinciæ——— *that all the Provinces ſhall in the laſt reſort make their appeal to him for all controverſies.* And *Nov.* 131. *c.* 3. *that in all that Dioceſe he ſhall have locum Apoſtolicæ ſedis, the place or dignity of an Apoſtolical ſeat*; which gave *Nicephorus* occaſion (in his relation of this matter) to affirme that the *Emperour* made it a *free city, and* αὐτοκέφαλον *an head unto it ſelf*, with *full power independent* from all others: And though the *firſt Biſhop* thereof was conſecrated by *Vigilius Biſhop of Rome*, as by ſome *Biſhop* it is certain he muſt, yet that is of no force againſt the *concluſion*, to which I deſigne this inſtance, it being evident that being *conſecrated*, he was *abſolute*, and *depended* not on any, and his * *ſucceſſors* were to be ordained by his *Councel* of *Metropolitanes*, and not by the *Pope*.

* *Quando autem te ab hâc luce decedere contigerit, pro tempore Archiepiſcopum ejus à venerabili ſuo Concilio Metropolitanorum ordinari ſancimus, quemadmodum decet Archiepiſcopum omnibus honoratum Eccleſiis provehi.* Ibid.

§. 9. Which as it makes a *ſecond inſtance* of the point in hand, ſo when it is remembred, that all this *independent abſolute* power was conferred upon this *city* (the *Emperors* favorite) only by his making it a *Primate's*, or *chief Metropolitane's See*, and that *Carthage's* being the *Prime Metropolis* of *Africk* is expreſſed by having the *ſame privileges*, that *Juſtiniana Prima* had, It will follow (what is moſt certain, and might otherwiſe be teſtified by innumerable evidences) that *every Primate*, or *chief Metropolitane* was *abſolute* within his own *circuit*, neither *ſubject* nor ſubordinate to any *forein Superiour*, whether *Pope*, or *Patriarch*; And that was all which was *uſeful* (much more then was *neceſſary*) to be here *demonſtrated*. And being ſo, there remains to the *See* of *Rome* no farther claim to the *ſubjection* of this *Iſland*, nor appearance of proof of the charge of *ſchiſme*, in caſting off that yoke, upon this *firſt* ſcore of S. *Peter's*, or his *ſucceſſors* right to the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*.

§. 10. Upon

§. 10. Upon this head of discourse depends also all that is, or can be said for the confining the *Catholick Church* to the number of those, who live in *obedience* to the *Roman Church*, or *Bishop*. For if there have been from the *Apostles times*, an *independent power* vested in *each Primate*, or *chief Metropolitane* (as hath been evidently shown) then how can it be necessary to the being of a *member* of the *Catholick Church*, to be *subject* to that one *Primate*? 'Tis certainly sufficient to the *conservation* of the *unity* of the whole *Church*, that every one pay an *obedience*, where an *obedience* is due, and no way usefull toward that end, that those that are *born free*, should *resigne* up, divest themselves of that *privilege*, and become ἀυθαίρετοι δουλοὶ *servants* or *subjects* of their *own making*. But I shall not enlarge on this matter, but conclude with that of our *Bishops* in *Convocation*, *Anno Chr:* 1537. in their *Book* intituled, [*The Institution of a Christian man:*] that *it was many hundred years before the Bishop of Rome could acquire any power of a Primate over any other Bishops, which were*

The unreasonablenesse of confining the Catholick Church to the number of those that live in the Roman subjection.

not

not within his Province in Italie, And that the Biſhops of Rome doe now tranſgreſſe their own profeſſion made in their Creation, For all the Biſhops of Rome alwaies when they be conſecrated and made Biſhops of that See, doe make a ſolemn profeſſion and vow, that they ſhall inviolably obſerve all the Ordinances made in the eight firſt General Councels, among which it is eſpecially provided, that all cauſes ſhall be determined within the Province, where they be begun, and that by the Biſhops of the ſame Province; which abſolutely excludes all Papal, i. e. forein power out of theſe *Realms.*

CHAP. VI.

Their third plea from the Biſhop of Rome having planted Chriſtianity among us.

§. 1. THE *next* part of the *Romaniſt's* arguing againſt us, is taken from a *peculiar right*, or claim, that the *Biſhop* or *See* of *Rome* hath to *our obedience*, upon the ſcore of having *planted Chriſtianity* among us.

§. 2. But before I proceed to ſhew the *invalidity* of this plea, I deſire it may firſt be obſerved, that the *pleading* of this, as the *title* by which the *Biſhop* of *Rome* hath right to our *ſubjection*, is abſolutely *unreconcileable* with his former *pretenſions* founded in his *œcumenical Paſtorſhip* by *ſucceſſion* to S. *Peter*; For certainly he that is ſuppoſed (in groſſe) to have that *original* title to *all power* over *all Churches*, cannot be imagined to *acquire* it *afterward* (by way of retail) over any *particular Church*. He that claims a *reward*, as of his own *labour* and travail, muſt be ſuppoſed to *diſclaim Donation*, which is *antecedent* to, and *excluſive* of the other, as the

The plea from Planting the Faith unreconcileable with the former.

the title of *deſcent* is to that of *Conqueſt*, And it is a very great *prejudice* to the *juſtice* of his pretenſions, who findes it neceſſary to mix things that are ſo *incompetible*.

A Dilemma to the Romaniſt.

§. 3. And therefore I am obliged to offer this *Dilemma* to the *Romaniſt* in this place, and to demand, Which is the *Pope's* true title to the *ſubjection* of this *Iſland?* the *Donation* of *Chriſt*, or *converſion* wrought by *Auguſtine* the *Monk?* If the latter be affirmed to be it, then it muſt be granted by him, both that this *Iſland* before the time of *Pope Gregory* was no way *ſubjected* to the *Romiſh See*, and withall that no *Chriſtian nation* is at this day thus *ſubject*, but ſuch as doth appear to have been *converted* by *Rome*, as the *Saxons* here are ſuppoſed to have been; And then this *conceſſion* will loſe more *ſubjects* to the *Apoſtolick See*, then the return of theſe *Iſlands* to the *deſired ſubjection* would ever be able to *countervail*, or recompenſe; and therefore it is reaſonable to inſiſt on the terms of this *bargain*, and not to *yeild* the one, till the other be *yeilded* to us, But if the former be affirmed to be it,

and

and that indeed the *commiſſion* from *Chriſt* to S. *Peter* be ſtill the *fundamental* hold, by which our *ſubjection* is, and alwaies hath been due to his *ſucceſſors*, then is that other of the *converſion* by *Auguſtine* but a *fallacious* pretenſe, a *non cauſa pro cauſâ*, to amuze us, and need not farther be anſwered, or invalidated, then by this *confeſſion*.

§. 4. But then paſſing by this *advantage*, and taking the *objection*, as it lies by it ſelf, theſe farther conſiderations will take off all force from it. 1. That this *Iſland* was converted to the *Faith* of *Chriſt*, lông before *Auguſtine's* preaching to the *Saxons*, either *in*, or very *neer* the *Apoſtles times*, in *Tiberius* his *reign*, ſaith *Gildas*, and long before *Tertullian's*, and *Origen's* time, as by them appears, *Tertull: in Apol:* and *Orig: in Ezech: Hom:* 4. To this I ſhall not need to adde the teſtimony of *Eleutherius* the *Biſhop of Rome*, in the vulgar *Epiſtle* to our *Lucius*, the firſt *Chriſtian King* of the world, ſtyling him *vicarium Dei in regno ſuo, God's vicegerent in his own kingdome*, becauſe, as there is ſome doubt of the *authentickneſſe*

The Faith planted here before *Auguſtine* the Monk.

thentickneſſe of that *Epiſtle*, ſo the only thing that we have now need to conclude from it, is otherwiſe evident, viz: *that the Nation was in his time converted*, and ſo long *before Auguſtine's* coming. And though by *Diocleſian's perſecution*, *Chriſtianity* were here ſhrewdly *ſhaken*, yet I ſuppoſe, that will not be thought *argumentative*, both becauſe it might be of *ill example* againſt *other* nations, where the *faith* was as bloodily perſecuted in that, or other times, and poſſibly at *ſome* point of time againſt *Rome* it ſelf, where S. *Peter's chair* was not alwaies *amulet* ſufficient to avoid the like *deſtructions*, and eſpecially becauſe it is evident, that the *Britiſh Church* ſurvived that *calamity*, three of our *Biſhops* being *ten years* after that, *preſent* (and their *names ſubſcribed*, *Eborius of Yorke*, *Reſtitutus of London*, *and Adelfius Coloniæ Londinenſium*) at the *Councel of Arles*, *eleven years* before the *firſt Councel of Nice*. So likewiſe at the time of that *Nicene Councel* it appears, that as *Britaine* was one of the *ſix Dioceſes* of the *Weſt Empire* (ſee *Notitia Provinc: Occident:*) ſo there were in it three

* *Suſcepiſtis nuper in Regno Britanniæ legem & fidem Chriſti.*

And not quite deſtroyed by *Diocleſian.*

three Metropolitanes, the *Biſhop of York* (his *Province Maxima Ceſarienſis*) the *Biſhop of London* (his *Province Britannia prima*) the *Biſhop of Caeruske* (his *Province Britannia ſecunda*) in *Monmouthſhire*, * which after in *King Arthur's* time was tranſlated to S. *Davids*, where it continued an *Archbiſhoprick*, till *King Henry* I. who ſubjected it to *Canterbury*, and †all this ſpace of about 500 years after *Auguſtines* coming, the *Biſhops* thereof, *eleven in number*, *were all conſecrated by the ſuffragan Biſhops of that Province, without any profeſſion, or ſubjection to any other Church, as the Annales there affirm.*

* See S. *Hen: Spelman, Concil: Anglic:* pag. 26. out of the Annales of *Giſburne.*

† *à Samſone uſq; tempus Henrici primi, ſederunt Meneviæ undecim Epiſcopi, & uſq; ad hoc tempus Epiſcopi Meneviæ à ſuis ſuffraganeis Wallenſibus ibidem fuerunt conſecrati, nullâ penitus profeſſione vel ſubjectione factâ alteri Eccleſiæ.* Ibid.

§. 5. To the ſame purpoſe is it, that when *Auguſtine* required *ſubjection* to the *Pope* and *Church of Rome*, the *Abbat* of *Bangor* is recorded to have returned him this *anſwer*, *Notum ſit vobis, quòd nos omnes ſumus*—— *Be it known unto you, that we are all ſubject, and obedient to the Church of God, and the Pope of Rome, but ſo as we are alſo to every pious and good*

The Britains rejection of the Biſhop of *Rome.*

good Chriſtian, viz: *to love every one in his degree and place, in perfect charity, and to help every one by word and dee, to attain to be the ſons of God*; † *Ego aliam obedientiam quàm iſtam non ſcio debitam ei quem vos nominatis eſſe Papam, nec eſſe Patrem Patrum vendicari & poſtulari, And for any other obedience I know none due to him whom you call the Pope, and as little doe I know by what right he can challenge to be father of fathers, Biſhop of Biſhops, or Univerſal Biſhop. Præterea nos ſumus ſub gubernatione Epiſcopi Caerlegionenſis ſuper Oſcâ—— As for us, we are under the rule of the Biſhop of Caerlegion upon Usk, who is to overlook and govern us under God.*

† *Concil: Anglic:* p. 188.

The invalidity of the argument from converſion, when the Britains were certainly not converted by *Auguſtine.*

§. 6. From hence the reſult is clear, that whatever is pretended from *Auguſtine* the *Monk*, or ſuppoſed to have been then preſſed by him, for the *advancing* of the *Popes* intereſt in this *Iſland*, and concluding us guilty of *Schiſme* in *caſting off* that yoke, yet the *Britiſh Biſhops* ſtill holding out againſt this *pretenſion*, and that with all *reaſon* on their ſide, if the title of *converſion*, which the *Romaniſt* pleads for our *ſubjection*, may be of any *va-*

lidity

lidity with him, it must needs *follow*, that the whole *Island* cannot upon this score of *Augustine's conversion*, be now deemed *schismatical*, it being certain, that the *whole Island*, & particularly the *Dominion of Wales*, was not thus converted by *Augustine*, nor formerly by any *sent* from *Rome*, or that observed the *Roman Order* (as appears by the observation of *Easter*, contrary to the usage received at *Rome*) but either by *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, or *Simon Zelotes*, as our *Annals* tell us most probably. And this in the first place must needs be yeilded to by those that expect to receive any *advantage* to their cause by *this* argument; And if they will still extend their *title* equally, to those parts of *Britannie*, which *Augustine* did *not*, as to those which he *did convert*, to *Wales*, as well as to *Kent*, it is evident they must doe it upon some *other* score (whatsoever the pretense be) and not upon this of *conversion*.

§. 7. But then 2dly, for as much of this *Island*, as was *really converted* to the *Faith* by the coming of *Augustine*, there is no title for their *subjection*, and the perpetual *subjection* of

No title from conversion for subjection.

of their *poſterity* from this.

§. 8. To examine this a while by other known *practiſes* of the *Chriſtian* world, S. *Paul* by himſelf or his *Apoſtles*, or *Procurators*, was the *great Converter* of the *Gentiles*; Concerning him I ſhall demand, whether all thoſe *nations converted* by him and his miniſters, are to all ages obliged to be ſubject to that *chair*, where S. *Paul* ſat (whether in the *Church* at *Antioch*, or *Rome*, or the like) at the time of his *ſending* out, or going himſelf to *convert* them; If ſo, then 1. there cannot be a greater *prejudice* imaginable to S. *Peter's Univerſal Paſtorſhip*; And 2. it will in the *ſtory* of the *fact* appear to have no degree of *truth* in it; *Timothie* that was placed over *Aſia* in *Epheſus*, and *Titus* over *Crete*, being (as hath formerly appeared) *ſupreme* in thoſe *Provinces*, and *independent* from any other *See*, And generally that is the nature of *Primates* or *Patriarchs*, to have no *ſuperior* either to *ordain*, or *exerciſe juriſdiction* over them, but themſelves to be *abſolute* within their *Province*, and their *ſucceſſors* to be *ordained* by the *ſuffragan Biſhops* under them;

them; which could not be, if every ſuch *Church*, where ſuch a *Primate* was placed, were *ſubject* to that *Church*, from which they received the *Faith*.

§. 9. To put this whole matter out of *controverſie*, It is, and hath alwaies been in the *power* of *Chriſtian Emperors*, and *Princes* within their *Dominions* to *erect Patriarchates*, or to *tranſlate* them from one *city* to another, and therefore whatever title is ſuppoſeable to be acquired by the *Pope* in this *Iſland* upon the firſt *planting* of the *Goſpel* here, this cannot ſo oblige the *Kings* of *England* ever ſince, but that they may freely *remove* that *power* from *Rome* to *Canterbury*, and *ſubject* all the *Chriſtians* of this *Iſland* to the *ſpiritual* power of that *Archbiſhop* or *Primate*, *independently* from any *forein Biſhop*. The power of Kings to erect Patriarchates.

§. 10. For the *erection* of *Primacies* or *Patriarchates*, that of *Juſtiniana Prima* † forementioned, and ſet down at large, is an evident proof, *Juſtinian* erecting that (long after the reſt of the *Primates* ſeats in the *Empire*) to be an *Archiepiſcopal See*, *abſolute* and *independent*, and *ſubjecting* all

† Examples in *Juſtiniana Prima*, c. 5. §. 8.

all *Dacia* the *new* to it, And though the *Pope Vigilius* was by the *Emperour* appointed to *ordain* the *first Bishop* there, yet were his *successors* to be *ordained* by his own *Metropolitanes*, and the *Bishops* under him not to *appeal* to any others, as hath in each particular formerly been *evidenced*.

Carthage.

§. 11. The same also hath in like manner been shewn of *Carthage*, which was by the same *Justinian* (not *originally* dignified, but) † after the rescuing it out of the *Vandales* hands, restored to a state of *Primacie*, after the pattern or image of *Justiniana Prima*, and *two Provinces* more annexed, then had antiently belonged to that *Bishops jurisdiction*.

† ἐξ οὗ τῶν ὁ θεὸς ταύτην ἡμῖν κατέστησε. Διάταξ: 131.

Ravenna.

§. 12. Before either of these the *Emperour Valentinian* the 3d, *Anno Christi* 432. by his *Rescript* constituted *Ravenna* a *Patriarchal seat*; And from his time that held the *Patriarchate* without any *dependence* on the *Bishop* of *Rome* to the time of *Constantinus Pogonatus*, And though at that time the *Greek Emperors Vicarii* or *Exarchs* being not able to support the *Bishop* of *Ravenna* against the *Longobards*,

Longobards, he was fain to flie for support to the *Bishop of Rome*, and so *submitted* himself unto him, and after *Reparatus*, the next *Bishop Theodorus* did the like to *Pope Agatho*, whether upon the score of great *friendship* with him, or in *despite* to his own *Clergie* (with whom he had *variance*) saith *Sabellicus*, yet the people of *Ravenna* thought themselves *injured* hereby, and joyned with their next *Bishop Fœlix* to maintain their *privilege*, though *Pope Constantine* stirring up *Justinian* Ῥινότμητος against them, they were *worsted*, and *defeated* in their attempt.

§.13. Other *examples* there are of this kinde,* *Balsamon* points at some, which from the † *Emperours charter* had this *privilege*, not to be *subject* to the *Patriarch of Constantinople*, calling them αὐτοκέφαλοι Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι, which were *Archbishops independent*: So under *Phocas*, the *Patriarchate* of *Grado* in *Italie* was erected, saith * *Warnefridus de gestis Longobard*: Others, as *Eginartus Chancellor* to *Charles* the *Great*, and who wrote his *life*, say it was done by *Charles* the *Great*. And so doth *Rhegino* who

* *de privileg: Patriar:*

† ἀπὸ τῆς φιλοτιμίας βασιλικῆς ἰδικῆς τοῦτο τὸ δίκαιον λαβόντες.

* l. 4. c. 34. *Grado.*

who lived in the next age. And accordingly in *Duarenus de Benef:* lib. 1. cap. 9. among the *Minorum Gentium Patriarchatus*, that of *Grado* is reckoned for one, and joyned with *Aquileia*, *Canterbury* and *Bourges*.

Frequent in the East.

§. 14. And that it was a frequent usage in the *East*, may appear by the 12th *Canon* of the *Councel* of *Chalcedon*, where we finde mention of πόλεις διὰ χαμμάτων βασιλικῶν τῷ τῆς μητροπόλεως ὀνόματι τιμηθῆναι, *cities honoured by letters patents from the Kings or Emperors with the name and dignity of Metropoles*, and where the *Councel* represses the *ambition* of *Bishops*, which *sought* those *privileges* διὰ πραγματικῶν, *by Rescripts from the Emperours*, and *censures* it, (in them that so sought it) as παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς ὅρους, *not agreeable to the Ecclesiastical Canons*, *repressing* the *ambition* of the *Bishops*, but not *cassating* the *Rescripts*, nor *withdrawing* the *honour* from the *Metropolis* so erected; Of this *Canon Balsamon* saith, that when it was made, many *Emperours* had erected many *Metropolitanes*, and naming *three*, adds, καὶ ἄλλαι πλείονες ἐτιμήθησαν, that *other Bishopricks*

ricks were thus honoured, and that the *Emperours* did it κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν, *according to the power that was given them.* Where it is farther to be obſerved, 1. that this *Councel* was within 20 years after that grant of *Valentinian*, and conſequently, if *Balſamon* ſay right, (that at that time many *Emperours* had erected *many*) there muſt needs be *others* before *Valentinian.* 2. That the 17th *Canon* of the *Councel* of *Chalcedon* doth more expreſly attribute this power to the *Prince*, Εἰ δὲ καί τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκαινίσθη πόλις, ἢ αὖθις καινισθείη, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις, καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω, *If a city be built or reſtored by the Kings power, let the Eccleſiaſtical order follow the Political.* And the ſame power is acknowledged to belong to the *Prince* by the *Councel in Trullo Can:* 38. And then 3. that theſe two laſt *Canons* are reconciled with that 12th of *Chalcedon*, by the *law* of *Alexius Comnenus*, and aſſented to by the *Synod* under him, See *Balſam: in Can:* 38. *Concil: in Trullo*, who concludes that the *King* might doe it αὐθορμήτῳ γνώμῃ, *upon*

his own incitation or motion, but it ſhould not be lawful for any by baſe ſollicitation to ſeek or obtain it, adding that in that caſe, *upon any ſuch Reſcript of the Emperour for ſuch erection, it might be lawful for the Patriarch to ſuſpend the confirmation of the Charter, untill he repreſented to the Emperour what the Canons were in that caſe, and underſtood if the Emperour did it οἰκόθεν from his own motion, which appearing, the Patriarch was to admit thereof.*

And accordingly the ſame *Balſamon* (on *Concil: Carthag: Can:* 16.) doth upon that *Canon* profeſſedly found the *authority* of *Princes*, Ἐπισκοπὴν εἰς μητρόπολιν ἄγειν-- καὶ ἐκ νέου ἐπισκόπους καὶ μητροπολίτας καθιστᾶν, *to advance an Epiſcopal See into a Metropolis, and anew to conſtitute Biſhops and Metropolitanes.*

So alſo to tranſlate.

§. 15. As for the *tranſplanting* it alſo from one *city* to another, beſides that the power of doing *that*, is conſequent to the *former*, the *examples* of this practiſe are *antient*, and *frequent* in *this* kingdome; The paſſage ſet down out of the *Annals* of *Giſburne* may be *ſufficient*, From *Caer-*

Examples in *England.* *Concil: Angl:* p. 26.

uke

uske the *Metropolitan* ſeat was *tranſlated* to S. *Davids* by *King Arthur*, where it continued till *Henry* I. and then was reduced to *Canterbury*.

§. 16. In like manner 'tis evident that the *Kings* of *England* have *divided Biſhopricks*, and *erected* new ones; About the year 630. *Kinigilſa King* of the *Weſt-Saxons*, and *Oſwald* of the *Northumbers*, *erected* an *Epiſcopal Se* at *Dorcheſter*, and placed *Birinus* in it, ſo ſaith *Guil: Malmesb: de Geſt: Pontif: Angl:* l. 2. About the year 660, *Kenewalch King* of the *Weſt-Saxons divided* this *Biſhoprick*, and left part to *Dorcheſter*, and aſſigned the *weſtern* part to be the *Dioceſe* of the *new Biſhop*, which he conſtituted at *Wincheſter*, ſo ſaith *Hen: Huntingd: Hiſt:* l. 3. Then *Wincheſter* was *ſubdivided* in the time of *King Ina*, who alſo erected a *new Biſhoprick* at *Sherburne*, and gave it to *Aldelme*, ſo *Henr: Huntingd:* l. 4. and *Guil: Malm: de Reg: Angl:* l. 1. c. 2. And after the *Norman* conqueſt, *Henry* I. divided *Cambridgeſhire* from the *See* of *Lincolne*, and *erected* the *Biſhoprick* of *Elie*, ſo ſaith *Guiliel: Malm: de Geſt: Pontif: Angl:* l. 4. and

Florentius Wigorn: Anno 1109. who lived at that time. So alſo ſaith *Eadmer* with ſome variation, *Regi, Archiepiſcopo, cæteríſque Principibus regni viſum fuit de ipſâ Parochiâ (Lincolniæ) ſumendum, quo fieret alter Epiſcopatus, cujus cathedra Principatus poneretur in Abbatiâ de Eli, It ſeemed good to the King, the Archbiſhop, and the reſt of the Princes of the kingdome to take as much out of the Dioceſe of Lincolne, as would make another Biſhoprick, the chair whereof ſhould be ſet up in the Abbacie of Elie.* Adding indeed that *Anſelme* (a *zealous* promoter of the *Papal* authority, as the *author Eadmer* was a *diſciple* and *admirer* of *Anſelme*) wrote to *Pope Paſchalis*, deſiring his *conſent* to it, as a thing fit to be done, and yet to which he aſſures him he would not give his *conſent*, but *ſalvâ authoritate Papæ, reſerving the rights of the Pope*; Which though it doth ſuppoſe the *Popes* pretenſions to that *authority* at *that* time, and *Anſelm's yeilding* it to him, yet it proves alſo this right of our *Kings* to have been even then *adhered* to, *preſerved*, and *exerciſed* by them, as the former *authors* had ſet it down. §. 17.

§. 17. Of this nature alſo is the *authority* of *Kings* in *exempting* any *Eccleſiaſtical* perſon from the *Biſhops Juriſdiction*, and granting *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction* to ſuch perſon, which is largely aſſerted and exemplified in *Cawdries* caſe 5. *Report*. 14. One inſtance of this will ſerve for all, that of *William* the *Conqueror*, who exempted *Battel Abbey* in *Suſſex* from the *Juriſdiction* of the *Biſhop of Chicheſter*, and gave the *Abbat Epiſcopal Juriſdiction* in his *Territorie* and the words of the *Charter* are produced by Mr *Selden* on *Eadmer*, *Hoc regali authoritate & Epiſcoporum ac Baronum meorum atteſtatione conſtituo, I appoint this by my royal authority by the atteſtation of my Biſhops and Barons.* So to exempt from Epiſcopal juriſdiction.

§. 18. Adde even unto this, that even the *Weſterne Princes* (in thoſe parts where the *Biſhops of Rome* have much *hightned* their *power*, ever ſince the *Kings* were *Chriſtians*) the *German Emperours*, the *Kings of France* and *England*, alwayes claimed to be *founders* of all *Biſhopricks* in their *Dominions*; *Patrons* of them to *beſtow* them by *inveſtiture*, that the Kings Founders of Biſhopricks and Patrons,

Kings of *France* and *England* often claimed and were acknowledged to have *right*, that no *Legate* from *Rome* might come into the Land, and uſe *juriſdiction* without their *leave*; All which put together are a *foundation* for this *power* of the *Princes* to *erect* or *tranſlate* a *Patriarchate*, It being withall acknowledged that *our Kings* have the ſame *authority* in their *Territories*, that the *Roman Emperour* had in the *Empire*.

The Reaſon of all, ſupreme power of Kings,

§. 19. And the *reaſon* of all this is *clear*, not only from the *ſupreme authority of Kings* in all ſorts of *cauſes*, even thoſe of the * *Church*, as well

* Ὁ Βασιλεὺς οἷα κοινὸς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπίσκοπος μοναρχης καὶ ἂν καὶ ὀνομαζόμενος, the King is as it were the common director and ruler of the Church, both in title and reality. *Demetrii Chomateni Reſp: ad Conſt: Cab: Jur: Græc: Rom:* l. 5. Ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν ἔσω ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ὅπισκοπος ἂν εἴην, Ye are Biſhops of the Church for thoſe things which are celebrated within it, but for external things, I am conſtituted overſeer or Biſhop by God, ſaith *Conſtantine* the Great in an aſſembly of Biſhops. Ἐγὼ Βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεύς εἰμι, I am King and Prieſt, ſaith *Leo Iſaurus* to *Gregory* the ſecond, *Nec tamen eo nomine à Pontifice reprehenditur*, and was not for this reprehended by the Pope, ſee *J. C. de lib. Eccl: ap: Goldaſt: Monarch:* t. 1. p. 686. So *Socrates* the hiſtorian, of the Emperours in general, after their receiving the faith of Chriſt, τὰ δ' ἐκκλησίας πράγματα

ματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν, the affairs of the Church depended on them, *in Proœm.* l. 5. And by *Optatus* l. 2. it is noted, and censured as a Schismatical piece of language in the Donatists, *Quid enim Imperatori cum Ecclesiâ?* And all this according to the principles of civil policy acknowledged by *Aristotle Pol.* 3. Βασιλέα τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριον εἶναι, the King hath power of those things that belong to the Gods; and by *Diotogenes* in *Stobæus*, that a perfect King ought to be both a good Captain, and a Judge, καὶ ἱερέα yea and a Priest also; And accordingly among the ancient Roman regal Lawes, this is one, *Sacrorum omnium potestas sub Regibus esto*, Let the power of all sacred things be under the Kings, and so in the practice, *Caius Cæsar in Suetonius* c. 13. was both *Augur* and *Summus Pontifex*. *Galba tres Pontificatus gerebat*, Ibid: Gal. c. 8. *Claudius* is by *Josephus* called Ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, the greatest High-priest, and *Tacitus* makes it his observation, *Deûm nunc munere summum Pontificem summum hominum esse. Annal:* l. 3. The same appears among the Jewish Kings in Scripture, *David* ordering the courses of the Priests, *Solomon* consecrating the temple, *Hezekiah* 2 *Chron:* 29. 2 *Kin:* 18. and *Josiah* 2 *Kin:* 22. ordering many things belonging to it. And so S. *Paul* appealed from the judgement of the chief Priests to the tribunal of *Cæsar*, see *G: de Heimberg: de usurp: Pap:* so in the Βασιλικὰ, the whole third book is made up of *Justinians*, i. e. the Emperours constitutions, *de Episcopis, Clericis & Sacris*, concerning Bishops, Clergy men, and sacred offices. And the Canons of Councels have mostly been set out (and received their authority) by the Emperours, and accordingly in the *Theodosian* Code we shall find many of those which are now called *Papal decrees*.

well as *Civil* (as might be proved at large, if here it were needful, and cannot be reasonably so *confined*, as not to belong to a matter of *this* nature) but peculiarly from that which hath

and Eccleſiaſtical diviſion of Provinces following the Civil.

been already noted (and expreſſely, ordered, *Can.*17. of the *Councel* of *Chalcedon* even now cited) of the *Eccleſiaſtical diviſion* of *Provinces* &c: following the *civil*, For 1. it being certainly in the *power* of the *King* to place his *Prætoria* or *courts* of *Aſſizes*, where he pleaſe; and 2. it being the known *original* of *Metropoles*, and *diviſions* of *Provinces* (as *Strabo* ſaith, *Geogr.*l.17. Αἱ ἐπαρχίαι διήρηνται ἄλλοτε μὲ ἄλλως, *Provinces are variouſly diſtributed*, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φύλα διαλέγειν αὐτὰς, ἀλλ' ἕτερον τρόπον διατάξαι διοικήσεις ἐν αἷς τὰς ἀγορὰς ποιοῦνται καὶ δικαιοδοσίας, *becauſe the Romanes divide them not by tribes or families, but after another manner in relation to the cities, where they ſet up their courts of Aſſizes*——) and again it being moſt *reaſonable*, that as any new *accident raiſes* one city to a greater *populouſneſſe*, or *depreſſes* another, ſo for the *convenience* of the people one ſhould be made the ſeat of *Judicature*, the other ceaſe to be ſo, (and no man ſo fit to paſſe the *judgement* when this ſhould be, as the *King*) and 3. the very ſame reaſons of *convenience* moving

moving in the *Church*, as in the *State*, the *Biſhops*, and over them *Metropolitanes* and *Primates* having their *judicatures*, and *audiences*, which in all reaſon muſt be ſo diſpoſed of, as may be moſt for the *convenience* of *adminiſtration*, that they and all under them may do their duties with moſt *facility*, and to greateſt *advantage*, and *laſtly* there being no *obſtacle* imaginable from any *contrary* conſtitution either of *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles*, againſt which the *Prince* can be ſaid to *offend* either *directly* or *interpretatively* (as I ſuppoſe is already clear from the refutation of the plea from *S. Peters univerſal Paſtorſhip*) whenſoever he ſhall think fit to make ſuch *changes*, the *Concluſion* is *rational*, as well as *evident*; *juſt* that it ſhould be ſo, as well as *cleare*, that elſewhere it hath oft been ſo *de facto*, (and appointed by the *Canon* of *Chalcedon de jure*) that the *King* may *erect* a *Primacy* when he pleaſe (and ſo it is certain that *King Ethelbert* at the time of *Auguſtines planting* the *faith*, did at *Canterbury*, the *ſeate* of his *Kingdome*, *Imperii ſui totius Metropolis* ſaith *Bede* l. 1. c 25.) & con-

quently *remove* it from any other place at his *pleasure*: Had it not been for this, there is no reason assignable, why, this *nation* being in *Constantines* time under three *Metropolitans*, the *Arch-bishop of York* (and the *Primacy* belonging to *that* city, as being then the *Emperours seat*, where *Septimius Severus*, and *Constantius Chlorus* died, and the *Prætorium* of the *Dioceſe* of *Britannie*) the *Arch-bishop of London*, and the *Arch-bishop of Caerusk in Monmouthshire*, either 1. there should be (as there was) an *addition* of *two Provinces* more, *Valentia*, and *Flavia Cæsariensis*, or 2. the *Metropolitical power* should be removed from *London* to *Canterbury* (as also from *Caerusk* to S. *David's*, as hath been said) and the *Primacie* from *Yorke* to *Canterbury*.

This Power of Kings if taken away by forein laws &c. resumable.

§. 20. Now what is thus vested in the *Regal power*, cannot be *taken away* by *forein laws*, or by *prescription* be so *alienated*, but that it remains perfectly *lawful* for the *Prince* to *resume* it.

§. 21. That *laws* made at *Rome* doe not take away the *liberty* of another *national Church* to make *contrary*

trary laws thereunto, and that by ſuch *obviation* no *Schiſme* is incurred, we finde delivered in the *Councel* of *Carthage* (*Can:* 71. according to *Balſamon's* diviſion) And though the *Canon* be not ſet down by *Binius*, yet both he and *Baronius* acknowledge, that what was contain'd in that particular *Canon*, was the main *occaſion* of the *Synod*; And the *Antiquity* thereof is conſiderable, thoſe *Canons* being made, ſay *Baronius* and *Binius*, *Anno* 401.

§. 22. So likewiſe that a *Law* (though made by a *General Councel* and with the *conſent* of all *Chriſtian Princes*, yet) if it have reſpect to a *civil right*, may, in this or that *nation*, be *repealed*, is the judgment of *Roger Widrington* (or *Father Preſton*) in his *laſt rejoinder to Fitzherbert* c. 11. §. 44. and c. 8. he confirms it by the *doctrine* of *Zuarez*, l. 2. *de leg:* c. 19. and the reaſon of *Zuarez* is, becauſe ſuch a *law* made at a *general* meeting of *Princes*, is *intrinſecally* a *civil law*; and hath not force by virtue of the *law* to binde the *ſubjects* of any *particular kingdome*, or *Common-wealth*, any other-

wiſe

wiſe then as it is enacted, or received by the *Governors* and *ſubjects* of that *kingdome*.

§. 23. And this is affirmed, and extended by *Balſamon* to all *Canons* in *general*, as the judgment of *learned* men, in his *notes* on that 16th *Canon* of the *Councel of Carthage* before cited.

So if alienated by preſcription, † *Clav: Reg:* l. 9. c. 12.

§. 24. And for the matter of *Preſcription*, the deciſion of † *Sayr* is worth obſerving, that in ſuch caſes as theſe, *Cum Præſcriptio ſit tantùm de jure Civili & Canonico, When the Preſcription is neither of the law of Nature, nor the Divine law, nor the law of Nations, but only of the Civil and Canon law,* there *non plus ſe extendit quàm unuſquiſque ſupremus Princeps in ſuo Regno eam ſuis legibus extenſam eſſe velit, it extends no farther then every ſupreme Prince in his Realm by his laws is ſuppoſed to will that it ſhall be extended,* which, ſaith he, cannot be ſuppoſed, in matters of this nature, of *exempting ſubjects from making their appeal to their King*, for ſaith he, *non eſt de mente alicujus Principis ut quiſpiam ſubditorum poſſit præſcribere quòd ad Principem ab-*

eo.

eo non appelletur, aut quòd eum coercere non poteſt, quando ratio & juſtitia poſtulat. It is not imaginable to be the minde of any Prince, that any of his ſubjects ſhould be able to preſcribe that he is not to appeal to his Prince (but to *ſome* other) *or that his Prince may not puniſh him when reaſon and juſtice requires*. It were eaſie to apply this *diſtinctly* to the confirming of all, that I here pretend, but I ſhall not thus *expatiate*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Their third Evidence from our caſting off Obedience to the Biſhop of Rome at the Reformation.

§. 1. UPon that *one* ground laid in the *former Chapter*, the *power* of *Kings* in *general*, and *particularly ad hunc actum* to *remove Patriarchates*; whatſoever can be pretended againſt the *lawfulneſſe* of the *Reformation* in *theſe kingdomes*, will eaſily be *anſwered*. And therefore ſuppoſing the *third*, and laſt *objection* to lie againſt our *Reformation*, that it was *founded* in the *caſting* off that *obedience* to the *Biſhop of Rome*, which was formerly paid him by our *Biſhops*, and *people* under them, I ſhall now briefly deſcend to that, *firſt* laying down the matter of *fact*, as it lies viſible in our *records*, and then *vindicating* it from all blame of *ſchiſme*, which according to the *premiſes* can any way be thought to *adhere* to it.

The hiſtory of what was done againſt the Biſhop of *Rome* in the Reformation.

§. 2. And *firſt* for the matter of *fact*, it is acknowledged, that in the *reigne* of *King Henry* VIII. the *Papal* (and with it all *forein*) *power* in *Eccle-*

Eccleſiaſtical affairs was both by *acts* of *Convocation* of the *Clergie*, and by *ſtatutes* or *acts* of *Parliament*, *caſt* out of this *kingdome*. The *firſt* ſtep or degree hereof was the *Clergie's ſynodical recognizing* the *King*, *ſingularem Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ Protectorem*, *unicum & ſupremum Dominum*—*the ſingular Protector, the only and ſupreme Head of the Church of England*, Upon this were built the *ſtatutes* of 24 *Hen:* VIII. *prohibiting* all *Appeals* to *Rome*, and for the *determining all Eccleſiaſticall ſuits, and controverſies within the kingdome*; The *ſtatute* of 25 *Hen:* VIII. for the *manner of electing and conſecrating of Archbiſhops and Biſhops*, and another, in the ſame year, *prohibiting the payment of all impoſitions to the court of Rome, and for the obtaining all ſuch diſpenſations from the See of Canterbury, which were formerly procured from the Popes of Rome*, and that of 26 *Hen:* VIII. *declaring the King to be the ſupreme head* (which in *Queen Elizabeth's reign* was, to avoid miſtakes, changed into *ſupreme Governour*) *of the Church of England, and to have all honours and præeminencies, which*

which were annexed to that title.

§. 3. This was in the next place attended with the *ſubmiſſion* of the *Clergie* to the *King*, agreed on, *firſt* in *Convocation*, and *afterward* in 25 *Hen:* VIII. enacted by *Parliament*, to this purpoſe, that *as it was by the Clergie acknowledged that the Convocation of the Clergie then was, alwaies had been, and ought to be aſſembled by the Kings writ, and as they ſubmitting themſelves to the King's Majeſtie had promiſed* in verbo ſacerdotis, *that they would never from thenceforth preſume to attempt, allege, claim, or put in ure, enact, promulge, or exerciſe any new Canons, Conſtitutions, Ordinances Provincial or other —— unleſſe the King's moſt royal aſſent may to them be had to make, promulge, & execute the ſame —— ſo it was now enacted, that none of the Clergie ſhould enact, promulge, or execute any ſuch Canons, Conſtitutions, and Ordinances Provincial or Synodical, without aſſent and authority received from the King, upon pain of impriſonment, and fine at the Kings pleaſure.*

§. 4. The *third* and *laſt* ſtep of this began with the debate of the *Univerſities*

verſities, and moſt *eminent Monaſteries* in the kingdome, *An aliquid authoritatis in hoc Regno Angliæ Pontifici Romano de jure competat, pluſquam alii cuiquam Epiſcopo extero? Whether any authority did of right belong to the Biſhop of Rome in the Kingdome of England more then to any other forein Biſhop?* and upon *agitation*, it was generally defined in the *negative*, and ſo returned teſtified under their *hands* and *ſeals*. The like was ſoon after *concluded*, and *reſolved* by the *Convocation* of the *Biſhops*, and all the *Clergie*, and *ſubſcribed* and *confirmed* by their *corporal oathes*: And at that time was written and *printed* the *Tract de verâ differentiâ Regiæ et Eccleſiaſticæ poteſtatis*, ſet out by the *Prelates*, the *chief* compoſers of which were, *John Stokeſly, Biſhop of London*; *Cuthert Tunſtall, Biſhop of Durham*; *Stephen Gardiner, Biſhop of Wincheſter*; and *Dr Thirlby* afterward *Biſhop*; where from the *practiſe* of the *Saxon*, and firſt *Norman Kings* they evidence the truth of that *Negative* out of ſtory. And what was thus concluded by the *Clergie* was ſoon turned into an *Act* of *Parliament*

ment alſo in 28 *Hen:* VIII. called *An Act extinguiſhing the authority of the Biſhop of Rome*, and preſcribing an *oath* to all *Officers Eccleſiaſtical*, and *lay*, of *renouncing the ſaid Biſhop and his authority*.

§. 5. By theſe *three* degrees it is acknowledged that the *Biſhops* and *Clergie* firſt, then the *King confirming* the *Acts* of the *Convocation*, and after making *Acts* of *Parliament* to the ſame purpoſes, *renounced* the *authority* of the *Roman See*, and *caſt* it out of this *Iſland*; and though the *firſt Act* of the *Clergie* in this were ſo induced, that it is eaſie to believe that nothing but the *apprehenſion of dangers* which hung over them (by a *Præmunire* incurred by them) could probably have inclined them to it, & therefore I ſhall not pretend that it was *perfectly* an *act* of their *firſt will*, and *choice*, but that which the *neceſſity of affairs* recommended to them, yet the matter of *right* being upon that occaſion taken into their moſt *ſerious* debate in a *ſynodical* way, and at laſt a *fit* and *commodious* expreſſion uniformly pitch'd upon by *joynt* conſent of both *houſes* of the *Con-*

The *Præmunire.*

Convocation, there is no reaſon to doubt, but that they did *believe* what they did *profeſſe*, the *fear* being the *occaſion* of their *debates*, but the *reaſons* or *arguments* offered in *debate*, the *cauſes* (as in all *charity* we are to judge) of their *deciſion*.

§. 6. But I ſhall not lay much weight on that *judgment* of *charity*, becauſe if that which was thus determined by *King* and *Biſhops* were *falſly* determined, then the *voluntarineſſe*, or *freeneſſe* of the *determination* will not be able to *juſtifie* it, and on the other ſide, if the *determination* were *juſt*, then was there *truth* in it, *antecedent* to, and *abſtracted* from the *determination*, and it was their *duty* ſo to *determine*, and *crime* that they were *unwilling* to doe it. And therefore the whole *difficulty* devolves to this *one enquiry*, Whether at that time of the *reign* of *Henry* VIII. the *Biſhop of Rome* were *ſupreme head*, or *Governour* of this *Church of England*, or had any *real authority* here, which the *King* might not *lawfully remove* from him to ſome other, *viz:* to the *Archbiſhop of Canterbury*, if he pleaſed.

§. 7. And

The Right of the Biſhop of *Rome* conſidered.

§. 7. And this is preſently determined upon the *grounds* which have been *formerly* laid, and confirmed to have *truth* in them. For the *pretenſions* for the *Popes ſupremacy* of *power* among us being by the aſſertors thereof founded in one of theſe *three*, either in his *right* (as S. *Peter's ſucceſſour*) to the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, that including his *power* over *England*, as a *member* of the *whole*; or 2. by the *paternal right* which by *Auguſtine's planting* the *Goſpel* among the *Saxons* is thought to belong to the *Pope* (and his *ſucceſſours*) that *ſent* him; or 3. in the *voluntary conceſſion* of ſome *Kings*; the two former of theſe have been largely *diſproved* already, *Chap.* 4, 5 and 6. in diſcourſes purpoſely, and diſtinctly applied to thoſe *pretenſions*. And for the *third*, that will appear to have received its *determination* alſo, 1. by the *abſoluteneſſe* of the *power* of our *Princes*, (to which purpoſe I ſhall mention but one paſſage, that of † *G. de Heimburg*, ſome *two hundred years* ſince in the laſt words of his *tract de Injuſt: Uſurp: Pap:* where ſpeaking of the *Emperors* making *oath* to the *Pope*

The conceſſion of Kings.

† *in Goldaſt: de Mon:*

Pope, he ſaith, that *this is a ſubmiſſion in him, and a patience above what any other ſuffers*, and proves it by this argument, *Nam eximius Rex Angliæ, Franciæ, Dux, Marchio, non aſtringitur Papæ quocunque juramento: factus Imperator jurare tenetur ſecundum Decretales eorum fabuloſè fictas, ita ut ſupremus Monarcha magis ſervilis conditionis, quàm quilibet ejus inferior fieri cenſeatur*, *The King of England and France, any Duke or Marqueſſe of that Kingdome is not bound to the Pope by any oath, yet the Emperour at his creation is thus bound to ſwear according to the Popes Decretals fabulouſly invented, ſo that the ſupreme Monarch is made to be of a more ſervile condition then any his inferior Prince*—.) And 2. by the *rights* of *Kings* to *remove* or *erect Patriarchates*, and will be farther confirmed in the *Negative*, if anſwer be firſt given to this *Dilemma*.

§. 8. The *authority* of the *Pope* in this *Kingdome*, which is pretended to be held by the *conceſſion* of our *Kings*, was either ſo *originally* veſted in our *Kings*, that they might *lawfully grant* it, to whom they pleaſed, and

A Dilemma againſt the plea drawn from that.

pleaſed, and ſo did *lawfully* grant it to the *Pope*; or it was not thus *originally* veſted in our *Kings*; If it were not, then was that *grant* an *invalid*, *null* grant, for ſuch are all *conceſſions* of that which is not *ours* to give, *preſumptions*, *invaſions*, *robberies* in the *giver*, which devolve no *right* to the *receiver*, and then this is a *pitiful* claim which is thus founded: But if that *authority* were ſo veſted in the *Kings of England*, that they might *lawfully* grant it to whom they pleaſed, (which is the only way by which the *Pope* can pretend to hold any thing by this *title* of *regal conceſſion*) then certainly the *ſame* power remains ſtill veſted in the *King* to diſpoſe it *from* him to *ſome* other as *freely*, as the ſame *King* may upon *good* cauſes *remove* his *Chancellour*, or any other of his officers from his place, and *commit* it to another (this way of arguing is made uſe of by the *Biſhops* in *Convocation*, *Anno Chr:* 1537. in the *Book* by them intituled [*The Inſtitution of a Chriſtian man*]) Or if the ſame *power* doe not ſtill *remain* in the *King*, then is the *King's power* diminiſhed, and he conſequently

ſequently by this his *act*, of which we treat, become *leſſe a King*, then formerly he was, And then we know that ſuch *acts* which make him ſo, are *invalid acts*, it being acknowledged to be *above* the *power* of the *King* himſelf, to *diveſt* himſelf and his *ſucceſſors* of any part of his *regal* power.

§. 9. To which purpoſe it muſt be obſerved, 1. that ſome things are ſo *ours*, that we may freely *uſe* them, but cannot freely *part* with them, as all thoſe things, wherein our *propriety* is not *confined* to our *perſons*, but intailed on our *poſterity*, and ſuch the *regal power* is ſuppoſed to be; 2. That as ſome things which are part of our *perſonal proprieties*, are ſo *freely ours* to *give*, that when they are *given*, they are departed out of our ſelves, and cannot juſtly be by us *reſumed* again (in which caſe that *Maxim* of the *civil law* ſtands good, *data eo ipſo quæ dantur, fiunt accipientis, what is given, by the very act of being given, becomes the goods of the receiver*) ſo other things are *given* to others, ſo as we doe *not part* with them our ſelves, they are as *truly*, and

Two ſorts of gifts.

and properly *ours*, *after*, as *before* the *Conceſſion*.

Some revocable.

§. 10. Thus the *Sun communicates* his *beams*, and with them his *warmth* and *influences*, and yet *retains* all which it thus *communicates*, and accordingly *withdraweth* them again, And *God* the *ſpring* of all *life*, and *grace*, doth ſo *communicate* each of theſe, that he *may*, and doth freely *withdraw* them again, and when he *taketh away our breath we die*— And thus certainly the *King*, being the *fountain* of all *power* and *authority*, as he is *free* to *communicate* this *power* to one, ſo is he equally *free* to *recall*, and *communicate* it to another, And therefore may as *freely beſtow* the *power* of *Primate*, and *chief Metropolitan* of *England*, or (which is all one) of a *Patriarch*, on the *Biſhop of Canterbury*, having formerly thought fit to *grant* it to the *Biſhop of Rome*, as he or any of his *Anceſtors* can be deemed to have *granted* it to the *Biſhop of Rome*; And then as this being by this means evidenced to be no more then an act of *regal power*, (which the *King* might *lawfully* exerciſe) takes off all *obligation* of *obedience*

ence in the *Biſhops* to the *Pope*, at the firſt minute, that he is by the *King* diveſted of that *power*, or declared not to have had it *de jure*, but only to have *aſſumed* it formerly (which *freedome* from that *obedience* immediately clears the whole buſineſſe of *ſchiſme*, as that is a *departure* from the *obedience* of the *lawful ſuperiour*) ſo will there not want many weighty *reaſons*, deducible from the *antient Canons*, as well as the *maximes* of *civil government*, why the *King* who *may freely* place the *Primacy*, where *he* pleaſe, ſhould chooſe to place it in a *Biſhop* and *ſubject* of his own *nation*, rather then in a *forein Biſhop* farre *removed*, and him not only *independent* from that *King*, but himſelf enjoying a *Principality*, or *territorie*, which it is too apparent how willing he is to *enlarge unlimitedly*, and to *improve* the *conceſſions*, which are either acknowledged, or *pretended* to be made him, to that purpoſe.

The reaſonableneſſe of revoking it.

§. 11. And here it is not amiſſe to obſerve, in the *reign* of *Queen Mary*, who was no way favourable to the *Reformation* in points of *doctrine* and *Liturgie*, and made all ſpeed to repeal

Title & power of Supreme head of the Church retained by Queen *Mary*.

peal what had been done in *King Edward's* time in that matter, yet 1. that ſhe left not the *title* of *Supreme head*, till the *third Parliament* of her *reigne*; and 2. that in the *ſecond Parliament authority* is granted her *to make, and preſcribe to all ſuch Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, as were erected by Henry the VIII. ſuch ſtatutes and orders as ſhould ſeem good to her*, and that *ſtatute* never repealed but expired: 3. that in her *third Parliament* it was with much difficulty obtained, that the *ſupremacie* of the *Pope* ſhould be acknowledged, the matter being urged by her, as that which concerned the *eſtabliſhing* the *Matrimonie* of her *Mother*, and her *legitimation*, which depended upon the *abſolute power of the Pope*: 4. that in the 4th year of her *reigne*, when the *Pope* ſent *Cardinal Petow* to be his *Legate* in *England*, and to be *Biſhop* of *Sarisbury*, ſhe would not permit him to *come* into the *Land*, neither could he have that *Biſhoprick*, which as it was ſome *check* to the *Pope's abſolute ſupremacy*, and an *aſſertion* and *vindication* of the *Regal power*, ſo being added to the former

it

it will be leſſe ſtrange, that this *Supreme power* of the *Popes* ſhould be by the *Biſhops* in the *reigne* of *Henry* VIII. *diſclaimed*, and *ejected*.

§. 12. Upon this bottome the *foundation* of *Reformation* being laid in *England*, the *ſuperſtructure* was accordingly *erected* by the *King* and *Biſhops* and *Clergie* in *Convocation*, but this not all at once, but by diſtinct ſteps and degrees. Somewhat in the *reigne* of this *Henry* the VIII. as in the *number* of the *Sacraments*, the *uſe* of the *Lords Prayer* &c. in the *Engliſh tongue*, and the *tranſlation* of the *Bible*, all reſolved on in *Synod*, the *King* which duly *aſſembled* it, *preſiding* in it by his *Vicar General*.

§. 13. This was much farther advanced in the time of his ſon *Edward* the VI. who being a *childe*, and the *Laws* and *Conſtitution* of this *Realm* committing the *exerciſe* of the *Supreme power* in that caſe, into the hands of a *Protector*, what was thus regularly done by that *Protector*, cannot be doubted to be of the ſame *force*, and *validity*, as if the *King* had been of *age*, and done it himſelf; Or

The advance of the Reformation in K^ng *Edward's* daies.

if it ſhould, it would be an unanſwerable *objection* againſt all *hereditary, ſucceſſive Monarchy*, a maim in that *form* of *Government*, which could no way be repaired, there being no *amulet* in the *Crown*, which ſecures the *life* of each *King*, till his *ſucceſſor* be of *age*, nor *promiſe* from *heaven* that the *children* of ſuch *Princes* ſhall, by ſucceeding to the *Crown*, advance by *miracle* to the *years*, and abilities of their *Parents*, So *irrational* is the *ſcoffe*, and exception of ſome, that what was done in *King Edward's* daies being the *Acts* of a *childe* is as ſuch to be *vilified*, and deſpiſed.

§. 14. In the *Reign* of this *Prince*, many *Changes* were made in the *Church*, and *Receſſions* from the *Doctrines*, and *practiſes* of *Rome*; Beſide that of *Images*, the *lawfulneſſe* of the *marriage* of the *Clergie* was aſſerted, a body of an *Engliſh Liturgie* formed, and ſetled for *publick* uſe, the *Euchariſt* appointed to be adminiſtred to the people in *both kindes*, &c. and though *Biſhop Gardner* of *Wincheſter*, and *Biſhop Bonner* of *London* made *oppoſition* againſt theſe *changes*, and for ſome misbehaviours herein, were *impriſon'd*,

impriſon'd, (and two more moderate, learned men, *Biſhop Tunſtal* of *Durham*, and *Biſhop Day* of *Chicheſter*, upon another ſcore) yet *Archbiſhop Cranmer*, and the reſt of the *Biſhops* making up the farre *greater* number, joyned with the *Supreme power* in the *Reformation*. And as it is no great marvell, that there ſhould be ſome (ſo few) *diſſenters*, ſo the *puniſhment* inflicted on them will not be deemed *exceſſive* by any, that ſhall compare it with the farre *ſeverer executions*, the *fire*, and *fagot*, which were ſoon after in *Queen Mary's* daies inflicted on *Archbiſhop Cranmer*, *Biſhop Ridley*, and *Biſhop Latimer*, as the reward of their diſputing in the *Synod* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, (and the like *cruelties* on multitudes more) and the *Exiles*, and *deprivations*, which befell ſo many others in her *Reigne*; However this can be no prejudice to the *regularity* of the *Reformation* in the *reigne* of *King Edward*, wrought, as hath been ſaid, by the *Supreme power*, with the *conſent* of the *major* part of *Biſhops*.

§. 15. That which afterward followed in the *beginning* of *Qu. Elizabeth's*. In Queen *Elizabeth's*.

beth's reigne, may be thought more *diſtant*, and *leſſe* reconcileable to our pretenſions, (not that of her *ſex*, her being a *woman*, for ſo was *Qu. Mary* before, which acted ſo *vigorouſly* for the *contrary* way, and the *conſtitution* of our *Monarchy* inveſts equally either ſex in the *plenitude* of *Regal power*, in *ſacred*, as well as *civil affairs*, and it was but to raiſe *envie* againſt the *Reformation* that *Queen Elizabeth's ſex*, as before *King Edward's non-age* hath by ſome been thought fit to be mention'd, and cannot by any *ſober* judgment be admitted to have any force in it) but becauſe, as it is from our *hiſtories* more pertinently objected, *moſt* of the *Biſhops* were by her *diveſted* of their *dignities*, and *new created* in their ſtead, To this therefore in the laſt place, I muſt apply my ſelf to give *ſatisfaction*. And 1.

§. 16. In this matter, as much as concerns the *Ordination* of thoſe *new Biſhops*, that it was performed *regularly*, according to the *Antient Canons*, each by the *Impoſition of* the *hands* of *three Biſhops*, hath been evidently ſet down out of the *Records*, and

and vindicated by Mr *Maſon* in his *Booke de Miniſt: Anglic:* and may there be view'd at large, if the Reader want ſatisfaction in that point.

§. 17. As for the *ſecond* remaining part of the *objection* which alone is pertinent to this place, it will receive anſwer by theſe degrees, Firſt that the *death* of *Cardinal Pool Archbiſhop of Canterbury*, falling neer upon the *death* of her *Predeceſſor Queen Mary*, it was very regular for *Queen Elizabeth* to aſſigne a *ſucceſſor* to that *See*, then *vacant*, *Archbiſhop Parker*; 2dly, that thoſe *Biſhops*, which in *Queen Mary's* daies had been *exiled*, and *deprived*, and had *ſurvived* that calamity, were with all juſtice reſtored to their *dignities*; 3dly, that the *Biſhops* by her *deprived*, and *diveſted* of their *dignities*, were ſo dealt with, for *refuſing* to take the *oath* of *Supremacy*, formed and enjoyned in the daies of *Henry* the VIII. and in the *firſt Parliament* of this *Queen revived*, and the *ſtatutes* concerning it reſtored to full force, before it was thus *impoſed* on them. So that for the *juſtice* of the cauſe of their *deprivation*, it depends *Immediatly* upon the

The Creation of new Biſhops in Queen *Elizabeth's* time, vindicated.

Right and *power* of the *Supreme Magiſtrate* to make *laws*, to impoſe *oathes* for the *ſecuring* his *Government*, and to *inflict* the *puniſhments*, preſcribed by thoſe *laws*, on the *diſobedient*, but *Originally* upon the truth of that deciſion of the *Biſhops*, and *Clergie*, and *Univerſities*, in the *reigne* of *Henry* the VIII. that *no authority belonged in this Kingdome of England to the Biſhop of Rome, more then to any other forein Biſhop.* The former of theſe I ſhall be confident to look on as an undoubted truth, in the maintenance of which *all Government* is concerned, and hath nothing, peculiar to *our pretenſions*, which ſhould ſuggeſt a *vindication* of it in this place, And the *ſecond* hath, I ſuppoſe, been ſufficiently cleared in the former *chapters* of this diſcourſe, which have examined all the *Biſhop* of *Romes* claims to this *Supremacy*, And both theſe grounds being *acknowledged* (or, till they be *invalidated*, or *diſproved*, *ſuppoſed*) to have *truth*, and force in them, the *concluſion* will be ſufficiently induced, that there was no *injuſtice* in that *Act* of the *Queens*, which *diveſted* thoſe

thoſe *Biſhops*, which thus *refuſed* to ſecure her *Government*, or to approve their *fidelity* to their *lawful Soveraign.*

§. 18. *Fourthly*, that thoſe *Biſhops* being thus deprived, it was moſt *Regular*, and *Neceſſary*, and that againſt which no *objection* is imaginable, (that of their due *Ordination* being formerly cleared) that *other Biſhops* ſhould be nominated, and *advanced* to thoſe *vacant Sees*, and that what ſhould be for the *future* acted by thoſe *new Biſhops* in *Convocation* was *regular*, *Synodical*, and *valid* beyond all *exception* in reſpect of the *formality* of it.

§. 19. *Fiftly*, that as by the *Uniform* and *joynt conſent* of theſe *Biſhops* thus conſtituted a *Declaration* of *certain Principal Articles of Religion* was *agreed on*, and ſet out by *Order* of *both Archbiſhops*, *Metropolitans*, *and the reſt of the Biſhops*, for the *Unity* of *doctrine*, *to be taught*, *and holden of all Parſons*, *Vicars*, *and Curates &c.* and this not before the *third year* of that *Queens reigne*, So *before* this time there had not been, as farre as appears, any *debate* in any

former Convocation of that *Queens reigne* concerning *Religion* (only an *offer* of a *diſputation* betwixt *eight Clergie-men* on each ſide, which came to *nothing*) but all done by the *Parliaments reſtoring* what had been *debated*, and *concluded* by *former Synods*, in the *reigns* of *King Henry the eight*, and *Edward the ſixt*, without any *new* deliberation in any *preſent Synod*. By this means were *revived* the *Statutes* for the *Regal Supremacy*, as alſo of the *book* of *Common-prayer*, as it was in the time of *Edward the ſixt*, (with few alterations) which included the *abolition* of the *Romiſh Miſſalls*. And ſo all this again, as farre as it concerned *Queen Elizabeth's* part in the *Reformation*, is regularly ſuperſtructed on the forementioned *foundation* of *Regal Supremacy* (with the concurrence, and adviſe of *Synods*) which hath been in the *former* part of this diſcourſe (I hope, ſufficiently) *vindicated*.

§. 20. And that being granted, it cannot be here *neceſſary*, or pertinent to deſcend to the conſideration of each *ſeveral* matter of the *Change* thus wrought in this *Church*, either

as

as branches of the *Reformation*, or under the name, or *title* of it. For our preſent *enquirie* being no farther extended, then this, whether the *true Church of England*, as it ſtands by *Laws eſtabliſhed*, have in *Reforming* been guilty of *Schiſme*, as that ſignifies in the firſt place a *receſſion*, and *departure* from the *obedience* of our *lawful Superiours*, and this being cleared in the *Negative*, by this one *evidence*, that all was done by thoſe, to whom, and to whom *only*, the *rightful power legally* pertained, *viz:* the *King*, and *Biſhops* of this *Nation*, ſuppoſing (as now *regularly* we may, having competently *proved* it, and anſwered all the colours, that have been offered againſt it) that the *Pope* had *no right* to our *obedience*, and conſequently that our *departure* from him is not a *departure* from our *obedience* to our *ſuperiours*, it is preſently viſible, that all other matters will belong to ſome other heads of *Diſcourſe*, and conſequently muſt be debated upon other principles, All *variation* from the *Church of Rome* in point of *Doctrine* if it ſhould (as I believe it will never)

ver) be proved to be *unjuſt*, falling under the head of *Hereſie*, not of *ſchiſme*; and for *acts* of *ſacrilege*, and the like *impieties* (as certainly *Henry the eighth*, and ſome others, cannot be freed from ſuch.) they are by us as freely charged upon the *actors*, as by any *Romaniſt* they can be, But yet *ſacrilege* is no more *ſchiſme*, then it is *adulterie*, and the *Church*, on which *one* ſin hath been *committed*, cannot be from thence proved to be *guilty* of *every* other.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Second ſort of Schiſme, as that is an Offence againſt mutual Charity, This divided into three ſpecies, and the firſt here examined.

§. 1. BUT beſide that *firſt ſpecies* of *ſchiſme*, as it is an *offence* againſt the *ſubordination*, which *Chriſt* hath by *himſelf* and his *Apoſtles* ſetled in the *Church*, (from the *guilt* of which I have hitherto indevoured to *vindicate* our *Church*) another was taken notice of, as it ſignifies an *offence* againſt the mutual *unity*, and *peace*, and *charity*, which *Chriſt* left among his *Diſciples*; And to that I muſt now proceed, as farre as the *Accuſations* of the *Romaniſt* give us occaſion to vindicate our *innocence*.

§. 2. And for *method's* ſake, this branch of *Schiſme* may be ſubdivided into *three ſpecies*. The *firſt* is a breach in the *doctrines*, or *Traditions*, a *departure* from the *unity* of the *Faith*, *which was once delivered to the ſaints*; under that head alſo comprehending the *inſtitutions* of *Chriſt*, of his *Apoſtles*, and of the *Univerſal Church* of

Three branches of the ſecond ſort of Schiſme.

of the *firſt* and *pureſt* ages, whether in *Government*, or other the like *obſervances* and *practiſes*: The *ſecond* is an *offence* againſt *external peace* and *Communion Eccleſiaſtical*: The *third* and *laſt* is the *want of that charity, which is due from every Chriſtian to every Chriſtian*. Beſide theſe I cannot foreſee any other *ſpecies* of *ſchiſme*, and therefore the *vindicating* our *Reformation* from all grounds of charge of any of *theſe three*, will be the abſolving the whole *task* undertaken in theſe ſheets.

1. A departure from the Unity of Doctrines, or Traditions Apoſtolical.

§. 3. For the *firſt* it may be conſidered either in the *Bullion*, or in the *coyn*, in the *groſſe*, or in the *retail*, either as it is a *departure* from thoſe *rules* appointed by *Chriſt* for the *founding* and *upholding* his *truth* in the *Church*, this *Unity* of *Doctrine* &c. or elſe as it is the aſſerting any *particular* branch of *Doctrine*, contrary to *Chriſts*, and the (*Apoſtolical, pure*) *Churches* eſtabliſhment.

Our Church vindicated from this, in two branches.

§. 4. And here it is firſt *ſuggeſted* by the *Romaniſt*, that by *caſting out* the *authority* of the *Biſhop of Rome*, we have *caſt off* the *head* of *all Chriſtian Unity*, and ſo muſt needs be guilty

guilty of *Schiſme* in this *firſt* reſpect. To which the *anſwer* is obvious, 1. that that *Biſhop of Rome* was never appointed by *Chriſt* to be the *head* of all *Chriſtian unity*, or that *Church* to be the *conſervatory* (for ever) of *all Chriſtian truth*, any more then any *other Biſhop*, or *Church* of the *Apoſtles ordaining*, or planting; and whatever can be pretended for the contrary will be eaſily *anſwered* from the grounds already laid, and cleared in the *former* part of this diſcourſe concerning the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of S. *Peter's ſucceſſors*, which muſt not be here ſo unneceſſarily repeated.

In the firſt, Chriſts Rules for upholding the truth.

§. 5. 2dly, That the way provided by *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles* for the *preſerving* the *unity* of the *faith*, &c. in the *Church*, is fully acknowledged by us, and no way *ſupplanted* by our *Reformation*. That way is made up of *two acts* of *Apoſtolical providence*, Firſt their *reſolving* upon ſome *few heads* of ſpecial force, and *efficacie* to the *planting* of *Chriſtian life* through the world, and *preaching*, and *depoſiting* them in *every Church* of their *plantation*. 2. Their eſtabliſhing an excellent

excellent *ſubordination* of all *inferior officers* of the *Church* to the *Biſhop* in every *city*, of the *Biſhops* in every *Province* to their *Metropolitanes*, of the *Metropolitanes* in every *region* or Διοίκησις to *Patriarchs*, or *Primates*, allowing alſo among theſe ſuch a *Primacie* of *Order*, or *dignity*, as might be proportionable to the Πρῶτος Σίμων in the *ſcripture*, and agreeable to what is by the *antient Canons* allowed to the *Biſhop of Rome*; And this ſtanding *ſubordination* ſufficient for all *ordinary* uſes, and when there ſhould be need of *extraordinary* remedies, there was then a ſupply to be had by congregating *Councels*, *Provincial*, *Patriarchal*, *General*, as hath formerly been ſhewed. And all this, it is moſt certain, *aſſerted*, and acknowledged by every *true ſon* of the *Church of England*, as zealouſly, as is pretended by any *Romaniſt*. And from hence, by the way, that ſpeech of the *learned* and *excellent Hugo Grotius* (which I diſcern to be made uſe of by the *Romaniſts*, and look'd on with *jealouſie* by others) will, I ſuppoſe, receive its *due* importance, and *interpretation*, in his *Rivet: Apologet: Diſcuſſ:*

Diſcuſſ: p. 255. *Reſtitutionem Chriſtianorum in unum idémq; corpus* &c.

§. 6. As for the *ſubjection* (and *dependence*) of this *Church* to the *Monarchick power* of the *Biſhop of Rome*, this will never be likely to tend to the *unity* of the whole *body*, unleſſe firſt *all* other *Churches* of *Chriſtians* paid that *ſubjection* too, and were obliged, and ſo by *duty* morally *aſcertain'd* alwaies to continue it (which it is evident the *Eaſtern Churches* had not done long before the time of our pretended *departure*) and 2. unleſſe the *Biſhop of Rome* were in probability able to *adminiſter* that *vaſt Province*, ſo as would be moſt to the *advantage* of the *whole* body, For which whether he be fitly *qualified* or no, as it is not *demonſtrable* in the *cauſes*, ſo is it to be looked on, as a *Politick Probleme*, the truth of which belongs to *prudent perſons*, and and ſuch as are by *God intruſted* with the *Flock* to judge of, i. e. to the *Princes*, the *nurſing Fathers of every Church*, who are *prudentially*, and *fatherly* to *determine* for themſelves and thoſe that are under them, what is moſt ordinable to that end, and

cannot

cannot be obliged to *conclude*, farther then the *motives* or premiſes will bear, to decree what they doe not *reaſonably*, and cordially *believe*.

In the Second, Particular doctrines.

§. 7. *Laſtly*, for the *particular doctrines* wherein we are affirmed by the *Romaniſts* to depart from the *Vnity* of the *Faith*, and ſo by *departing* from the *unity*, to be *ſchiſmatical*, as *heretical* by *departing* from the *faith*, this muſt be conteſted by a ſtrict ſurvey of the *particular doctrines*, wherein as we make no doubt to *approve* our ſelves to any that will judge of the *Apoſtolical doctrine* and *traditions* by the *Scriptures*, and *conſent* of the firſt 300 years, or the *four Generall Councels*, (the moſt *competent witneſſes* of *Apoſtolical traditions*) ſo we ſhall ſecure our ſelves of our *innocence* in this behalf, by that *principle* acknowledged in our *Church*, and owned, as the *rule* by which we are concluded in any *debate*, or *controverſie*: That whatever is *contrary* to the *doctrine*, or *practiſes* of thoſe *firſt* and *pureſt ages*, ſhall by us (aſſoon as it thus appears) be *renounced*, and diſclaimed alſo. Which reſolution of *nulineſſe*, and *obedience*, will, I ſuppoſe,

The Church of *England's* temper in reſpect of particular doctrines.

poſe, conſerve us in the *unity* of the *Faith*, and render us approveable to *God*, though our *ignorance* (thus *unaffected*) ſhould betray us to ſome *miſunderſtandings* of thoſe *firſt* times, and be an inſtrument much more probable to *lead us into all truth*, then the ſuppoſed *infallibility* of the *Church of Rome* can be imagined to be, which as it leaves the *proudeſt preſumer* really as *liable* to *error*, as him that acknowledgeth himſelf moſt *fallible*, ſo it *aſcertains* him to *perſevere incorrigible* whether in the *leaſt*, or *greateſt error*, which by *fault*, or *frailty* he ſhall be guilty of.

§. 8. This *conſideration* of the *humble*, *docible* temper of our *Church* (together with our profeſſed *appeal* to thoſe *firſt* and *pureſt* times, to ſtand or fall, as by thoſe evidences we ſhall be adjudged) as it neceſſarily renders it our *infelicity*, not our *crime*, if in *judging* of *Chriſt's truth* we ſhould be deemed to *erre*, ſo may it reaſonably *ſuperſede* that larger trouble of the *Reader*, in this place, which the *view* and *examination* of the *ſeverals* would coſt him, it being thus farre *evident*, that it is our avowed

vowed *wiſh* and our *care* (ſhould it be denied to be our *lot*) a ſpecial *mark* of the *Church of England's Reformation*, to *preſerve the Unity of the Apoſtolical Faith and Primitive practiſes, as intire, as we would have done Chriſt's body or garment*, and the probability being not *weak* on our ſide, that the *fact* of the *crucifying ſouldiers* which hath ſo much of our *abhorrence* and *deteſtation*, ſhall never be our *choice*, our *known*, or *wilfull guilt*, or if it be, that we ſo farre *recede* from our *Profeſſion*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

The Second ſpecies of this Schiſme examined, as it is an offence againſt external peace, or Communion Eccleſiaſtical.

§. 1. NOW for the *ſecond branch* of this *ſecond ſort of Schiſm*, as it is an *offence* againſt *external peace* or *communion Eccleſiaſtical*. This cannot with any colour be charged on us, of whom theſe 6 things are *manifeſt*, and that by the *tenure* of our *Reformation*, 1. that we have alwaies retained the *form* of *Government*, in, and under which the *Apoſtles* founded *Eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies*, or *Communion*, viz: that of the *Biſhop*, and his *inferiour officers* in every *Church*, and ſo in that reſpect are, in *Ignatius* his phraſe ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου, *within the altar*, have no part of that *breach* of *Eccleſiaſtical communion* upon us, which conſiſts in *caſting* out that *order*. 2. That as we maintain that *Order*, ſo we regularly *ſubmit* to the *exerciſe* of it, acknowledge the due *authority* of theſe *Governors*, profeſs *Canonical obedience* to them, *ſubmit*

This Church free from breach of Communion Eccleſiaſtical.

As appears by ſix Conſiderations.

The firſt.

The ſecond.

mit to their *Cenſures*, and *Decrees*, and give our ſelves up to be *ruled* by them in all things that belong to their *cognizance ſecundum Deum, ac-*

The third. *cording to God.* 3. That the *circumſtances* which are neceſſary to the ἐπισυναγωγία the *aſſembling* our ſelves together for the *publick worſhip*, whether 1. that of *place*, (our *Churches conſecrated* to thoſe *offices*) or 2. that of *time*, (the *Lords day*, and other *primitive feſtivals*, and *Faſts*, and, in their degree, *every* day of the *week*) or 3. that of *forms* of *Prayer*, and *Praiſes*, *celebration* of *Sacraments*, and *ſacramentals*, *Preaching*, *Catechizing*, &c. or 4. that of *Ceremonies*, ſuch as the practiſe of the *Primitive Church* hath ſent down *recommended* to us; or laſtly, that of *Diſcipline* to *binde* all theſe performances upon every *member* of the *Church* in his *office*, or place, are *all* entered into our *Confeſſions*, ſetled by *Article*, as part of our *eſtabliſhment*, and ſo the *want* of *either*, or *all* of thoſe are not imputable to our *Reformation*.

The fourth. §. 2. *Fourthly*, That in every of theſe *three*, whatſoever the *Romaniſt* requires

requires us to adde farther to that which we *voluntarily*, and profeſſedly *receive*, (1. the *ſupreme, tranſcendent, monarchick power* of the *Pope*, 2. the *acknowledgment* of, and *obedience* to his *ſupremacy*, 3. the uſe of more *ceremonies, feſtivals*, &c.) is *uſurpation*, or *impoſition* of the *preſent Romaniſts*, abſolutely without *Authority*, or *Precedent* from the *antient, Primitive Church*, from whom we are ſo unwilling to *divide* in any thing, that we chooſe a *conformity* with them, rather then with any *later* modell, and if by receding from the *Ordo Romanus* in any *particular*, we doe not approve our ſelves to come neerer to the *firſt*, and *pureſt* times, it is the *avow'd Profeſſion of our Church*, the *wiſh*, and *purpoſe* of it, which I may juſtly ſtyle part of our *eſtabliſhment*, to *reduce*, and *reſtore* that, (whatſoever it is) which is moſt *pure*, and *Primitive* in ſtead of it.

§. 3. *Fiftly*, That as we *exclude* no *Chriſtian* from our *communion*, that will either *filially*, or *fraternally* embrace it with us, being ready to admit *any* to our *aſſemblies*, that acknowledge the *Foundation* laid by *Chriſt*, The fift.

Chriſt, and his *Apoſtles*, ſo we as earneſtly deſire to be admitted to the like freedome of *external Communion* with all the members of *all* other *Chriſtian Churches*, as oft as occaſion makes us capable of that *bleſſing* of the *one heart*, and *one lip*, and would moſt willingly, by the uſe of the *antient* method of *literæ Communicatoriæ*, maintain this *Communion* with thoſe, with whom we cannot *corporally aſſemble*, and particularly with thoſe which live in *obedience* to the *Church* of *Rome*.

The ſixt. §. 4. *Sixtly*, that the onely hindrances that interpoſe and obſtruct this deſired freedome of *external Communion*, are wholly imputable to the *Romaniſts*.

§. 5. *Firſt*, their *excommunicating*, and *ſeparating* from their *aſſemblies* all that maintain *communion* with the *Church of England*, which we know was done by *Bull* from the *Pope* about the *tenth* year of *Q. Elizabeth* (*before* which time thoſe *Engliſh*, which had not joyned in our *Reformation*, might, and did come to our *aſſemblies*, and were never after *rejected* by us, but upon their avowed

contu-

contumacie againſt the *orders* of our *Church*, which conſequently brought the *cenſures* on them) and to that it is viſibly *conſequent*, that we that were *caſt out*, cannot be ſaid to *ſeparate*, as in the former part of this *diſcourſe* hath been demonſtrated.

§. 6. *Secondly*, their impoſing ſuch *conditions* on their *Communion* (*belief* of *doctrines*, and *approbation* of *practiſes*, which we neither *believe*, nor *approve* of, and are ready to *conteſt* and maintain our *Negatives*, by grounds that all good *Chriſtians* ought to be *concluded* by) that we cannot without *ſinning*, or *ſeeming* to *ſin* againſt *conſcience*, without *wilfull falling* on one ſide, or *diſſembling* and *unſound confeſſion* on the other ſide, or at leaſt the *ſcandal* of one of theſe, accept of their *communion* upon ſuch *conditions*, as hath formerly been demonſtrated alſo.

§. 7. And in this matter it were very well worthy our conſidering, how farre the *Articles* of our *Church of England* proceed in *accord* with the *preſent Roman doctrines* and *practiſes*, and in what particulars ἐπέχομεν, we *cannot perſwade* our ſelves

A conſideration concerning our Church.

to conſent to them, and then to offer it to the *Umpirage* of any *rational arbitrator*, whether we that unfeignedly *profeſſe* to *believe* ſo much and *no more*, nor to be *convinced* by all the *reaſons*, and *authorities*, proofs from *Scripture*, or the *firſt Chriſtian writers*, (thoſe of the *firſt three hundred* years) or the *four General Councels*) produced by them (being in full *inclination* and *deſire* of minde, ready to *ſubmit* upon *conviction*) are in any *reaſon*, or *equity*, or according to any *example*, or *precept* of *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles*, or the *antient, Primitive Church*, to be required to offer *violence* to our *mindes*, and to make an *unſound profeſſion*, or elſe (for that *one guilt* of not doing ſo) to be *rejected* as *hereticks*, and denied the *benefit* of *Chriſtian Communion*, which we heartily deſire to *extend* and *propagate* to them which *deny* it to us. All this thus put together, and applied to this preſent matter, will certainly vindicate us from all appearance of guilt of this *ſecond branch* of the *ſecond ſort* of *Schiſme*.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The third ſpecies of this Schiſm, as an offence againſt that charity due from every Chriſtian to every Chriſtian, examined.

§. 1. LAſtly, as *Schiſm* is an *offence* againſt that *charity* which is *due* from *every Chriſtian* to *every Chriſtian*, ſo it will be beſt *diſtributed* (according to what we ſee noted by by the *Apoſtle*, *Rom.* 14. in the *Jewiſh*, and *Gentile Chriſtians*) into the *judging*, and the *deſpiſing* of *others*, either of which was, if not *formally Schiſm*, yet ſoon *improveable* into it, when it would not be repreſſed by the *Apoſtles admonitions*, The *Jewiſh Chriſtians* we know *judged*, and *damned* all that would not obſerve the *Moſaical law*, and would not *aſſociate*, or *communicate* with the *Gentiles*, and the like *height Diotrephes*, and ſome of the *Gentile believers*, who began with the *other* branch, that of *vilifying* the *weak Jew*, at laſt arrived to, *not receiving*, *forbidding to receive*, *and caſting out the brethren*, 3 *Joh.* 10. And whether the *Romaniſts* or *we*, are

Contrary to charity due from all to all.

1. Judging.
2. Deſpiſing.

Separating the effect of both.

are thus *guilty*, will ſoon be *diſcernible*.

Of Judging & ſeparating the Romaniſts guilty *ex Confeſſo*

§. 2. For the former, that of *judging*, and ſo *ſeparating* from their *brethren* (if yet we may be allowed that *title*) it is evident by their own acknowledgment, how *guilty* they are, and how *guiltleſſe* we.

§. 3. It hath been a ſpecial *motive*, and *argument* to gain *proſelytes* to their party for ſome years, that by *our Confeſſion* there is *ſalvation* to be had among *them*, but in their *judgment* no poſſible *hope* of it for *us*. This weapon of their's uſed ſo ſtudiouſly againſt us, to *anticipate* and *prejudge*, in *general*, whatſoever can be *particularly* ſaid to *aſſert* our *doctrines*, and *practiſes*, will certainly be as uſefull in our hands, as *Goliah's ſword* in *David's* to give this wound (I wiſh it may not prove as *fatal*) to our *vaunting enemies:* For certainly, if there be any *truth* in that *motive*, then are they *profeſſedly* the men, that *judge their brethren*, and as *confeſſedly* we the men, that doe *not judge* them. And if S. *Cyprian's* rule be true (who had as well conſidered the *nature* of *Schiſm*, and as diligently armed the

Chriſtians

Chriſtians of his age againſt it, and given us as ſure *rules* to judge by, in this matter, as any) that they that maintain any *difference* in opinion againſt other *Chriſtians*, muſt, if they will avoid the *evil* of *ſchiſm*, manage it with this *temper* (*neminem damnantes, neminem à communione noſtrâ arcentes*) *never condemn any, or forbid them our communion*, then is the *ſchiſm* (becauſe the *uncharitableneſs*) on *their* parts, not on *ours*. And it is not the ſaying, we are *Heretickſ*, and ſo *certainly* excluded *ſalvation, Schiſmaticks*, and ſo *out* of the *Church*, the *way* to *ſalvation*, that can give this *ſanguinarie judgment* any meeker a *title*; For that we are ſuch, being as much *denied*, as any thing, and that *negative* offered to be *proved*, and *vindicated* by all thoſe *evidences*, by which any matter of *doctrine*, (from whence this *queſtion* depends) can duly be cleared, this *unproved affirmation*, that we *are ſuch*, is certainly a *petitio principii*, *a begging of the queſtion*, a *ſuppoſing* that in the *debate*, which they know we are as farre from *confeſſing*, as they from having *proved*, and that is the moſt certain

proof, that ſuch *judging* is *uncharitable*; I wiſh there were not many other as *pregnant indications* of it.

Of deſpiſing. We are guiltleſſe of it.

§. 4. And for that of *deſpiſing* or *ſetting at nought the brother*, which is the *Apoſtles* argument alſo that they *walk not charitably*, and the effect whereof is evident, the *caſting them out of the Church*, if the *cauſe* may be concluded by the *effect*, the guilt lies on the *Romaniſts* ſide, not on ours (as hath formerly appeared) And truly we are ſo ſenſible of the many *preposſeſſions*, and *ſtrong prejudices*, which by the *advantage* of *education*, the *preſcribed credulity* to all that the *Church* ſhall propoſe, the *doctrine* of *infallibility*, the *ſhutting up* the *ſcriptures* in an *unknown language*, the *impoſſibility*, that the *multitude* ſhould *ſearch*, or examine *tradition* with their *own* eyes, the *proſperous flouriſhing* eſtate of the *Roman Church* (and the *perſecutions*, and *calamities*, and expreſſions of *God's diſpleaſure* on the *Church of England*) the literal ſound of [*Hoc eſt corpus meum*] for their principal (eſpouſed) *doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and ſom other the like means, are infuſed into the *multitude* of

of men and women, that are brought up without any *knowledge* of *ours*, in a firm *belief* of all their *pretenſions*, that we are as farre from *ſetting* them *at nought*, or *deſpiſing* them, as from that (which by *their* doing it *firſt* is made *impoſſible* for *us* to be guilty of) *the caſting them out of the Church.*

§. 5. I foreſee not any *objection*, which may give me *temptation*, or *excuſe* farther to enlarge on this matter, And profeſſe not to know any other *branch* of *Schiſm*, or *colour* of faſtening that *guilt* upon our *Church*, made uſe of by any, which hath not been either prevented in the *grounds* of this diſcourſe, or *diſtinctly* taken notice of, and *competently vindicated*, as farre as the deſign'd *brevity* would permit.

CHAP. XI.

Concerning the preſent Perſecution of the Church of England, *and the advantages ſought from thence.*

§. 1. OUr *Eſtabliſhment* being thus freed from *Schiſm*, I ſhall not now entertain my ſelf with any *fear*, that the *Perſecution*, which we are under, will *involve* us in it. Yet can I not but take notice of the *ſtyle*, that ſome *Romaniſts* have in theſe *laſt* years, on *this occaſion*, choſen to make uſe of, calling us [*the late Church of England*] The *interpretation* whereof is to my underſtanding this, that the *calamities*, under which now we ſuffer, have made us *ceaſe* to be a *Church*: And therefore having *learned*, and abundantly *experimented*, what *ſcandal* the *Croſſe* hath alwaies carried along with it, how willing enemies are to take *advantage*, and ground *arguments* on *afflictions*, and how ordinary it is for *friends*, to take *impreſſions* from ſuch *ſenſible*, *carnal* motives, and being *ſecured* by the *ſtorie* of the *Antient Gnoſticks*, that it is neither *ſcandalous exceſſe* of *fear*, nor

The Romaniſts argument frō our preſent condition of Perſecution.

nor want of *charity*, to think it poſſible, that this, as other *antient hereſies*, may now as in a *Platonick year* (if not carefully warded) *return* on us, as in a revolution, I ſhall therefore conclude this paper with an attempt to remove this *prejudice*; The utmoſt whereof being formed into an *objection*, is this, that it is abſolutely neceſſary to *communicate* with ſome one *viſible Church*, that now the *Church of England* is not ſuch, and conſequently that it muſt be *caſt off*, and the *Roman Church* ſo *illuſtriouſly* viſible, be taken up in ſtead of it.

§. 2. To this reſerve I ſhall make my returns by theſe *degrees*, *First* that by the making this *objection*, or drawing any *argument* againſt any *member* of the *Church of England*, from the *preſent* περιστάσις, or *improſperous circumſtances* of affairs, It muſt be ſuppoſed, that *twenty years* ſince, this perſon, the *ſuppoſed ſubject* of diſcourſe, living regularly in this *Church*, under his *ſuperiours*, was not then chargeable wth this crime of not *communicating* with a *viſible Church*. Answered.

§. 3. This *conſequent* I ſhall not be

ſo much my own flatterer as to think it will be allowed me by the *Romaniſt*, who will, I know, at another time *accuſe* the whole *Church of England* (ever ſince the *Reformation*) of *ſchiſm* from the *Catholick Church*, and make the *communicating* with it 20 years ſince, as *dangerous* as now the not *communicating* with any: But the *reaſon* of my laying this *foundation* is, to ſhew the vanity of the *preſent objection*, For if the *Church of England* 20 years ſince, were *not* a *Church*, but a *ſociety* of *Schiſmaticks*, not a *particular Church* (which, if ſo, muſt be a *part*, or member of the *Univerſal*, and ſuch it is not, if it be truly *ſeparated* from that *body*, in the *unity* of which it is obliged to *remain*) but a *ſeparated*, and *torn off*, and ſo a *liveleſſe*, *ejected branch*, then whatſoever hath *now* befallen us, and the *conſequence* of that, the ſuppoſed *impoſſibility* of *cõmunicating* with the *Church of England*, will but leave us where we *were*, the *impoſſibility* of *communicating* with a *ſchiſmatical ſociety*, being not chargeable on us, as a *crime*, by them, who make the *communicating* with all ſuch *ſocieties* ſo

damnable;

damnable; And therefore I ſay, to the making this any *objection*, 'tis neceſſary, that that be ſuppoſed, which I have for that cauſe laid as my *foundation*, that 20 *years* ſince a *member* of the *Engliſh Church* was not under this guilt of *not communicating* with ſome one *viſible Church*; And if then he were not, (or, for diſcourſe ſake, be by the *objecter* ſuppoſed not to have been) then it *infallibly*, and irrefragably follows (which is the *ſecond propoſition*) that he that 20 *years* ſince was *not* under this *guilt* of *not communicating* — is either *not guilty* of it *now*, or elſe hath *voluntarily committed* or *omitted* ſomewhat, which *commiſſion* or *omiſſion* hath been the contracting of this *guilt*. For that ſomewhat, which hath not been his *choiſe*, ſhall become his *crime*, that what hath been his *ſaddeſt* part of *infelicity*, the *evil* againſt which he hath moſt induſtriouſly *contended*, ſhould be accounted his *offence*, when it is his *puniſhment*, I ſhall not fear will be affirmed by any.

§. 4. *Thirdly* then, the buſineſſe is brought to this iſſue, that that perſon, which is the ſubject of our diſcourſe

courſe (he that 20 *years ſince*, was a member of the *Church of England*) be now proved by ſome *commiſſion* or *omiſſion* of his, *voluntarily* to have contracted this *guilt*, or elſe be abſolved, and *freed* from it; If he have contracted it, it muſt be by ſome *irregularity* of actions, contrary to the ſtanding *rule* and *Canons* of this *Church*; or by *diſobedience* to ſome *commands* of his *Eccleſiaſtical ſuperiors*; And as in neither of theſe I ſhall *excuſe* any that hath been *guilty*, ſo if, being not fallen under the *actual Cenſures* of the *Church* for it, he now *timely* and *ſincerely* return with *contrition*, and *reformation*, I ſhall hope it will not be *imputed* to him; But however this cannot be inſiſted on by the *objecter*, becauſe I ſpeak, and ſo muſt he, of him that hath lived *regularly* (not of him that hath not) And of him 'tis apparent, that all that he hath done, is, to *adhere* to his *former principles*, when others have *not*, to have *teſtified* his *conſtancy* with (not only *venturing* but) *actually loſing* either *poſſeſſions*, or *liberty* (and the benefit of *Eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies*) rather then he would

would *joyn*, or *appear* to joyn with *Schiſmaticks*, when others have made all *worldly* advantages by the *rupture*; In a word, that he hath been *patient*, and *not fainted*; and never *departed* from his *rule*, though it have coſt him *dear* to ſtick *faſt* to it; And I hope no body will be ſo *uncharitable*, as *to grieve*, and gall him, *whom God hath thus ſuffered* to be *chaſtiſed*, upon no other *provocation*, but this, his having been thus *afflicted* and *perſecuted*. This is too clear a truth to need *confirming*, and yet this is the utmoſt, that it can be driven to, *ſuppoſing* the moſt that the *objection* can be imagined to *ſuppoſe*, *viz:* that the *Church of England* is now *inviſible*.

§. 5. But then in the *fourth* place, it muſt be added, that as yet, *Bleſſed be God*, the *Church of England* is not *inviſible*; It is ſtill *preſerved* in *Biſhops* and *Presbyters rightly ordained*, and multitudes *rightly baptized*, none of which have fallen off from their *profeſſion*; And the only thing imaginable to be *objected* in this point, being this, that the *ſchiſm* hath ſo farre been *extended* by the *force*, that many, if not *moſt Churches parochial* are

are filled by thoſe, who have ſet up a *new*, or a *no-form* of *worſhip*, and ſo that many men cannot any otherwiſe, then in *private* families, *ſerve God*, after the *Church-way*, that ſure will be of little weight, when the *Romaniſts* are remembred to be the *objecters*, who cannot but know, that this is the *only* way, that they have had of *ſerving God* in this *Kingdome*, theſe *many* years, and that the *night-meetings* of the *Primitive Chriſtians* in *dens* and *caves* are as pertinent to the *juſtifying* of *our* condition, as they can be of *any*, and when 'tis certain, that the ἐγκαλάλιψις τ ἐπισωαγωγῆς, *the forſaking of the aſſemblies*, *Heb.* 10. 25. is not ἑκούσιον, *our wilfull fault* v. 26. but only our *unhappy lot*, who are forced either not to *frequent* the *aſſemblies*, or elſe to *incourage* (& incurre the *ſcandal* of ſeeming to *approve*) the *practiſes* of thoſe that have *departed* from the *Church*. That we doe not decline *order*, or *publick communion*, and conſequently are not to be charged for not *enjoying* thoſe *benefits* of it, which we vehemently *thirſt* after, is evident by the *extenſive* nature of our *perſecution*, the

ſame

ſame tempeſt having with us thrown out all *order*, and *form*, *Biſhops*, and *Liturgie* together, and to that *curſtneſſe* of theirs, and not to any *obſtinateneſſe*, or *unreconcileableneſſe* of ours (which alone were the *guilt* of *non-communion*) is all that *unhappineſſe* of the *conſtant ſons* of the *preſent Engliſh Church* to be imputed, in which alone this whole *objection* is founded.

§. 6. I cannot diſcern any farther appearance of *difficulty* in this matter, and therefore ſhall no farther lengthen this *Appendage*, then by offering it to the conſideration of the *indifferent Reader*, whether this *objection* can ever in *future* times be improveable into a *charge* againſt us, or our *poſterity*, as long as either *Biſhops* ſtand, and continue to *ordain* among us, or it is not *our faults* that they doe not *ſtand*. To which purpoſe it may be remembred, what befell the *Jewes* whether under the *Zelots* fury, or the *Romans* yoke; The *former threw* out the *lawfull ſucceſſive High Prieſts*, and *Prieſts of the ſons of Aaron*, and put into thoſe *ſacred* offices the moſt *ignorant ruſticks*, ſome

What this may come to in the future.

ſome ſo void of all degree of *knowledge*, ſaith *Joſephus*, that they knew not what the very word [*Prieſt*] ſignified. The *Roman Conquerours* by their *Procurators* put in *annually* whom they pleaſed to *chooſe* (without conſideration of the *Aaronical line*) into the *chief Prieſt's office*; I ſhall here demand of any, Whether (ſuppoſing and granting it as *undeniable*, that the *Zelots* were formally *Schiſmaticks*, or with ſome *improvement*, in *Joſephus* his ſtyle σαπασαὶ, *ſeditious*) there can be any ground of *reaſon*, or equity, to involve, or *conclude* under the ſame *guilt* thoſe that lived *under* thoſe *impoſed*, uſurping *High Prieſts*, ſuppoſing thoſe *inferiors* to have been as farre from *conſenting* to the *continuance*, as to the *beginning* of ſuch *uſurpation*, and that the *circumſtances* were ſuch, that they lay not under the *appearance* of doing, what they did not, and ſo had not the *ſcandal*, any more, then the *reality* of that *guilt*. The *Reader*, I ſuppoſe, will be able to anſwer this *Quære* to himſelf, and ſuperſede all neceſſity of making up the *Parallel*.

§. 7. And

§. 7. And then I have at this time no farther *exerciſe* for him, but that he will joyn in *ardent prayers* with me, that *God* will *reſtore* that which is *loſt*, *reduce* that heavenly *grace*, and *incomparable bleſſing* of *Chriſtian peace* and *holy communion* among all, that have received the *honour* of being *called* by his *name*, that we may all *minde the ſame thing*, fix the *ſame common* deſignes, *love*, and *aid*, and *promote* one anothers good, unanimouſly *glorifie* him here with *one tongue*, and *heart*, that we may all be *glorified* with him, and ſing joynt *Hoſannah's*, and *Hallelujah's* to him to all *eternity*. *Amen*. The Concluſion.

ERRATA.

PAge 42. line 3. *dele*)
p. 73. li. 9. *lege* S. *Peter*, ſo--
p. 81. marg: li. 12. *lege* αὐτόθι
p. 85. l. 24. *lege* Where as
p. 91. li. 4. *lege* μυλοσίδεϊ
p. 107. li. 2. for third *lege* ſecond
p. 141. li. 25. for *quæ* re: *quo*
p. 157. li. 3. *lege* that *the*

The Contents.

CHAP. I.

AN Introduction, the danger, and ſin of Schiſm. page 1

CHAP. II.

What Schiſm is, together with ſome general conſiderations thereon. 12

CHAP. III.

The ſeveral ſorts of Schiſm. 31

CHAP. IV.

The pretended evidences of the Romaniſt againſt the Church of England examined, and firſt that from the Biſhop of Rome's Supremacy by Chriſt's donation to S. Peter. 66

CHAP. V.

The evidences from the Biſhop of Romes ſucceeding S. Peter examined. 92

CHAP. VI.

Their ſecond plea from the Biſhop of Rome having planted Chriſtianity among us. 107

CHAP. VII.

Their third Evidence from our caſting off Obedience to the Biſhop of Rome at the Reformation. 132

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the ſecond ſort of Schiſm, as that is an offence againſt mutual Charity, This divided into three ſpecies, and the firſt here examined. 155

CHAP. IX.

The ſecond ſpecies of this Schiſm examined, as it is an offence againſt external peace, or Communion Eccleſiaſtical. 163

CHAP. X.

The third ſpecies of this Schiſm, as an offence againſt that charity due from every Chriſtian to every Chriſtian, examined. 169

CHAP. XI.

Concerning the preſent Perſecution of the Church of England, and the advantages ſought from thence. 174

THE END.

A Catalogue of ſome Books Printed for *Richard Royſton* at the Angel in Ivie-lane, *London*.

A Paraphraſe and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Teſtament by *Henry Hammond* D. D. in *fol.*

The Practical Catechiſme, with all other Engliſh Treatiſes of *Henry Hammond* D.D. in two volumes in 4°.

Diſſertationes quatuor, quibus Epiſcopatus Jura ex S. Scripturis & Primæva Antiquitate adſtruuntur, contra ſententiam D. Blondelli *& aliorum. Authore* Henrico Hammond. *in* 4°.

A Letter of Reſolution of ſix Quære's, in 12°.

The names of ſeveral Treatiſes and Sermons written by *Jer. Taylor* D.D. *viz.*

1. Ἐνιαυτὸς, A Courſe of Sermons for all the Sundaies of the Year; Together with a Diſcourſe of the Divine Inſtitution, Neceſſity, Sacredneſſe, and Separation of the Office Miniſterial, in *fol.*
2. Epiſcopacy aſſerted, in 4°.
3. The Hiſtory of the Life and Death of the Ever-bleſſed Jeſus Chriſt, 2d Edit. in *fol.*
4. The Liberty of Propheſying, in 4°.
5. An Apology for authorized and Set-forms of Liturgie; in 4°.
6. A Diſcourſe of Baptiſme, its inſtitution and efficacy upon all Beleivers, in 4°.
7. The Rule and Exerciſes of holy living, in 12°.
8. The Rule and exerciſes of holy dying, in 12°.
9. A ſhort Catechiſme for inſtitution of young perſons in the Chriſtian Religion, in 12°.
10. The Reall Preſence and Spirituall of ϵ H R I S T in the Bleſſed Sacrament proved againſt the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, in 8°.

Certamen

Certamen Religioſum, or a Conference between the late King of *England*, and the late Lord Marquis of *Worceſter* concerning Religion, at *Ragland* Caſtle; Together with a Vindication of the Proteſtant Cauſe, by *Chr. Cartwright* in 4°.

The Pſalter of *David*, with Titles and Collects according to the matter of each Pſalm, by the Right honourable *Chr. Hatton*, in 12°.

Boanerges and *Barnabas*, or Judgement and Mercy for wounded and afflicted ſouls, in ſeveral *Soliloquies*, by *Francis Quarles*, in 12°.

The life of Faith in Dead Times, by *Chr. Hudſon* in 12°.

Motives for Prayer upon the ſeven dayes of the Week, by Sir *Richard Baker* Knight, in 12°.

The Guide unto True Bleſſedneſs, or a Body of the Doctrine of the Scriptures, directing man to the ſaving knowledge of God, by *Sam. Crook*, in 12°.

Six excellent Sermons upon ſeveral occaſions, preached by *Edward Willan* Vicar of *Hoxne*, in 4°.

The Dipper dipt, or the Anabaptiſts duck'd and plung'd over head and ears, by *Daniel Featly* D. D. in 4°.

Hermes Theologus, or a Divine Mercury: new deſcants upon old Records, by *Theoph. Wodnote*, in 12°.

Philoſophical Elements, concerning Government and Civil ſociety: by *Thomas Hobbs* of *Malmesbury*, in 12°.

An Eſſay upon *Statius*, or the five firſt books of *Publ. Papinius Statius* his *Thebais*, by *Tho. Stephens* School-maſter in S. *Edmonds-bury*, in 8°.

Nomenclatura Brevis Anglo-Latina Græca in uſum Scholæ Weſtmonaſterienſis, per F. Gregory, *in* 8°.

Grammatices Græcæ Enchiridion in uſum Scholæ Collegialis Wigorniæ, in 8°.

A Diſcourſe of Holy Love, by Sir *Geo. Strode* Knight, in 12°.

The Saints Honey-Comb full of Divine Truths, by *Rich. Gove* Preacher of *Henton* S. *Gorge* in *Somerſetſhire*, in 8°.

Devotion digeſted, into ſeveral Diſcourſes and Meditations upon the Lords moſt holy Prayer: Together with additional Exercitations upon Baptiſm, The Lords Supper, Hereſies, Blaſphemy, The Creatures, Sin, The ſouls pantings

tings after God, The Mercies of God, The ſouls complaint of its abſence from God; by *Peter Samwaies*, Fellow lately reſident in Trinity College, *Cambridge*, in 12°.

Of the Diviſion between the *Engliſh* and *Romiſh* Church upon Reformation, by *Hen. Fern* D. D. in 12°.

Directions for the profitable reading of the Scriptures, by *John White* M. A. in 8°.

The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of 9. the moſt worthy women of the world, 3 Jews, 3 Gentiles, 3 Chriſtians, by *Tho. Heywood*, in 4°.

The Saints Legacies, or a Collection of promiſes out of the Word of God, in 12°.

Judicium Univerſitatis Oxonienſis de Solemni Lega & Fœdere, Juramento Negativo &c. in 8°.

Certain Sermons and Letters of Defence and Reſolution to ſome of the late Controverſaries of our times by *Jaſper Mayne* D. D. in 4°.

Janua Linguarum Reſerata, ſive omnium Scientiarum & Linguarum ſeminarium, Auctore Cl. Viro J. A. Comenio, in 8°.

A Treatiſe concerning Divine providence, very ſeaſonable for all Ages, by *Tho. Morton* Biſhop of *Dureſme*, in 8°.

Animadverſions upon Mr. *Hobbs* his *Leviathan*, with ſome Obſervations upon Sir *Walter Rawleighs* Hiſtory of the World, by *Alex. Roſſe*, in 12°.

Fifty Sermons preached by that learned and reverend Divine *John Donne*, in *fol.*

Wits-Common-wealth, in 12°.

The Banquet of Jeſts new and old, in 12°.

Balzac's Letters the fourth part, in 8°.

Quarles Virgin Widow a Play, in 4°.

Solomons Recantation, in 4°. by *Francis Quarles.*

Ameſii antiſynodalia, in 12°.

Chriſt's Commination againſt Scandalizers, by *John Tombes* in 12°.

Dr. *Stuart*'s Anſwer to *Fountain*'s Letter, in 4°.

A Tract of Fortifications, with 22 braſſe cuts, in 4°.

Dr. *Griffiths* Sermon preached at S. *Pauls*, in 4°.

Bleſſed birth-day, printed at *Oxford*, in 8°.

A Diſcourſe of the ſtate Eccleſiaſtical, in 4°.

An Account of the Church Catholick where it was before the Reformation, by *Edward Bougben* D.D. in 4°.

An Advertiſement to the Jury-men of *England* touching Witches, written by the Author of the Obſervations upM^r. *Hobbs* Leviathan, in 4o.

Epiſcopacy and Presbytery conſidered, by *Hen. Fern* D.D. in 4°.

A Sermon preached at the *Iſle of Wight* before His Majeſty, by *Hen. Fern* D. D. in 4o.

The Commoners Liberty or the Engliſh-mans Birth-right, in 4o.

An Expedient for compoſing Differences in Religion, in 4°.

A Treatiſe of Self-denial, in 4o.

The holy Life and Death of the late Vi-counteſſe *Falkland* in 12°.

Certain Conſiderations of preſent Concernment: Touching this Reformed Church of *England*, by *Hen. Fern*, in 12o.

Englands Faithful Reprover and Monitour, in 12o.

Newly publiſhed,

The grand Conſpiracy of the Members againſt the Minde, of Jews againſt their King. As it hath been delivered in four Sermons, by *John Allington*, B. D. in 12o.

The Quakers Queſtions objected againſt the Miniſters of the Goſpel, and many ſacred acts and offices of Religion, with brief Anſwers thereunto: Together with a Diſcourſe of the holy Spirit his workings and impreſſions on the ſouls of men, by *R. Sherlock*, B. D. in 8°.

Now in the Preſſe,

Of Fundamentals in a notion referring to Practiſe, by *H. Hammond*, D. D. in 12o.